CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

January — March 1958

LONDON
S·P·C·K
1958

Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1

Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex

V, 159
1958

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Professor Leonard Hodgson, D.D.

The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer, Bishop of Exeter.

The Rev. Canon E. S. Abbott, Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.

EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

EPISCOPAL-PRESBYTERIAN RELATIONS — *E. L. Mascall*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY IN THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT: A SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL APPROACH — *R. T. Halliday*

HENRY DESPENSER: THE FIGHTING BISHOP — *R. A. Edwards*

THE TWO BACKGROUNDS OF FAITH — *Fr Hugh, S.S.F.*

THE LITURGICAL AND ECUMENICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED "WORLD CALENDAR" — *Chad Varah*

CHURCH SCHOOL FINANCE IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE — *W. E. Tate*

A NOTE ON "THE EPISCOPAL LICENSING OF SCHOOL-MASTERS IN ENGLAND" — *Gladys Jenkins*

THE MISSIONARY AIM — *P. A. Micklem*

MICHAEL FURSE — *Cyril E. Hudson*

CORRESPONDENCE

REVIEWS

A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.

339500

REVIEWS

BASIL MITCHELL (ed.): *Faith and Logic: Oxford Essays in Philosophical Theology*, MICHAEL B. FOSTER: *Mystery and Philosophy*, and ADAM FOX: *Plato and the Christians.* By Geoffrey Allen

J. HEYWOOD THOMAS: *Subjectivity and Paradox.* By T. H. Croxall

C. A. MACE (ed.): *British Philosophy in the Mid-Century: A Cambridge Symposium.* By D. M. Mackinnon

E. L. MASCALL: *Words and Images: A Study in Theological Discourse.* By D. M. Mackinnon

JOSEF PIEPER: *Justice.* By D. M. Mackinnon

E. C. BLACKMAN: *Biblical Interpretation.* By the Editor

ANDRE PARROT: *The Temple of Jerusalem.* By J. Robinson

ANDRE PARROT: *Golgotha and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.* By A. J. G. Hawes

ROBERT GRAVES and JOSHUA PODRO: *Jesus in Rome.* By H. H. Hoskins

MARY E. FINCH: *Five Northamptonshire Families (1540-1640).* By Gordon Huelin

C. B. MOSS: *The Church of England and the Seventh Council.* By S. L. Greenslade

G. E. MCCRACKEN and ALLEN CABANISS (eds.): *Early Medieval Theology.* By H. E. W. Turner

R. BULTMANN: *History and Eschatology.* By the Editor

W. R. MATTHEWS and W. M. ATKINS (eds.): *A History of St Paul's Cathedral and the Men associated with it.* By Seiriol Evans

ARNOLD TOYNBEE: *An Historian's Approach to Religion.* By E. Carpenter

BLISS FORBUSH: *Elias Hicks: Quaker Liberal.* By E. Carpenter

BERNARD LEEMING, S.J.: *The Principles of Sacramental Theology.* By Humphrey Green

JOSEPH CONNELLY: *Hymns of the Roman Liturgy.* By D. R. Dendy

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD: *The Liturgy and the Christian Faith.* By D. R. Dendy

G. W. O. ADDLESHAW: *The Early Parochial System and the Divine Office.* By Bernard Wigan

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

The Reverend E. L. MASCALL, D.D., is Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford, and Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion.

The Reverend R. T. HALLIDAY, B.D., is Assistant Curate of St Andrew's, St Andrews, Fife.

Canon R. A. EDWARDS is Canon Residentiary and Vice-Dean of Norwich Cathedral.

The Reverend Fr HUGH, S.S.F., was an officer in the Royal Engineers for twelve years before joining the Society of St Francis.

The Reverend CHAD VARAH is Rector of St Stephen's, Walbrook, London, E.C.4.

Mr W. E. TATE, B.LITT., F.S.A., is Lecturer in Education in the University of Leeds, and was formerly Headmaster of Sneyd Holy Trinity School, Burslem.

Mrs GLADYS JENKINS, whose husband is Professor of English at Westfield College, London, is engaged in historical research in the Elizabethan period.

The Very Reverend P. A. MICKLEM was Rector of St James', Sydney, from 1917 to 1937 and Provost of Derby from 1937 to 1947.

Canon C. E. HUDSON is a Canon Residentiary of St Albans and was Diocesan Chaplain to Bishop Furse from 1928 to 1935.

CLARE KIRCHBERGER: *Richard of St Victor: Selected Writings on Contemplation.* By T. L. Manson, S.S.J.E.

H. HENSLEY HENSON: *Theology and Life.* By the Bishop of Willesden

THE AUTHOR OF "THE WAY": *A Guide for Spiritual Directors.* By George M. Bosworth

O. H. GIBBS-SMITH: *Message for a Mission: The Kingdom of God as a Christian Ideology.* By G. J. Inglis

MALDWYN EDWARDS: *The Signs of our Times.* By Maurice B. Reckitt

J. C. POWELL-PRICE: *Notes for the Assistance of Governors and Managers of Church Schools.* By F. A. Poulden

BORIS SIMON: *Ragman's City.* By T. Dilworth-Harrison

SPENCER LEESON: *Christian Education Reviewed.* By the Bishop of Peterborough

THE PRIORESS OF WHITBY: *Archbishop Garbett: A Memoir.* By F. O. T. Hawkes

RUSSELL KIRK: *Prospects for Conservatives* and *Beyond the Dreams of Avarice.* By H. G. G. Herklots

S. W. H. BIRD: *"And unto Smyrna".* By A. E. A. Sulston

DEAN E. HESS: *Battle Hymn.* By H. G. G. Herklots

EDITORIAL

THE April number of the Australian *Church Quarterly* contains an interesting article by Professor R. H. Fuller of Seabury, U.S.A., on current issues in German theology. He explains that the prevailing tone of the generation between the wars was a violent reaction against the liberalism of the pre-war period. Headed by Karl Barth, theology kept the world at arm's length in order to strengthen its own defences and dig deeper its foundations. This movement has proved to be an instance of *reculer pour mieux sauter*, and the Christian attack has now moved on again to the frontiers between faith and non-faith. Of this movement there have been three chief leaders, Heim, Bultmann, and Bonhoeffer. Heim's interest has been mainly in the sciences. He accepts the position that God has been excluded from the sciences and abandons any effort to establish God by scientific argument. He pursues the sciences to their logical conclusion, and then finds a sphere beyond their limits where there is room for God. He thus presents the thinker with an either/or: either Jesus or complete despair. Bultmann's thesis is well known. He wishes to commend the faith to modern man by stripping away all its mythology. The main point of interest is to see whether the object he is peeling turns out to be an artichoke or an onion: whether any factual core is left when the process of demythologizing is done. Bonhoeffer dislikes both methods: Heim's is merely the extraction of a *deus ex machina*, Bultmann does not go far enough! It is not merely the mythological elements in Christianity that put off modern man; the specifically religious elements, God, faith, and so on are equally foreign to his thinking. Bonhoeffer therefore wishes to go back to Barth's original attack on religion before he "became orthodox", and to produce for himself a non-religious theology. Before his murder in a Nazi concentration camp he even outlined a treatise on the subject, describing God as the completely "other". The Church that participates by faith in this otherness of God, in this "being there for others", will begin by surrendering its endowments, revising its creeds, and revolutionizing its training for the ministry. It seems naturally to follow that the Word of God

can no longer be communicated by words but only by deeds—particularly by a readiness to suffer. To us this all seems characteristically German not only in its anxiety to embrace the cross but in its effort to reduce to absurdity every view previously held and in its incapacity to see more than one side of the truth at once. Why it should be regarded, even for the moment, as the *ne plus ultra* of theology, Heaven alone knows.

A theology of work? We certainly seem to need one in view of the unceasing labour troubles and the apparent lack of any principle in any quarter except that of self-interest. An article on the subject in *Theology Today* (July 1957) by Professor Otto Piper of Princeton is specially opportune. He disposes of the "modern heresy that work as such is good and a service of God" on the ground that in Germany it has led to the view that life derives all its meaning from the fact that a person keeps himself busy. What then is work as distinct from mere busyness? An effort towards the production of a good. Since the effort carries with it a chance of success it gives dignity to the worker, and may be further defined as the transforming of a piece of nature into one's own personality. It is through work that a man acquires personality. Although it enhances the self, the fact that he is working upon nature curbs his subjectivity and keeps him sufficiently objective. It is noteworthy that work is not merely utilitarian. Until the arrival of modern technology more goods were produced for artistic and luxury purposes than for purely practical uses. The fact that work produces something essentially new enables the creature to share in the dignity of creation and enables him to fulfil the priestly function of working in co-operation with his fellows and in harmony with God. It is also noteworthy that work, while it satisfies some needs, always arouses others. There is for instance increased need for distribution of the new goods. It is therefore a mistake to think that automation will mean a reduction in the amount of work. If this seems a gloomy prospect we can reflect on the distinction between compulsory and voluntary work, and remember that even the wage-slave can realize himself as a king and priest of God when he is pursuing his own creative interests in his leisure hours. If he can carry some of that spirit back into his compulsory work he may yet learn to take

pride in the whole finished product, of which he perchance contributes only an infinitesimal part, and feel there too his harmony with God. Without some over-ruling thought work of itself will never unite the workers. Indeed the sin of man has so entered into all his activities that, left alone, work can easily divide us, and workers may continue to drive one another into Siberia or a Hungarian massacre. It is one of the marvels of God's goodness that in spite of the sinfulness of his workers he still uses them to establish his kingdom.

It is excellent news, although by the time this magazine is in the hands of our readers it will be growing a little stale, that the National Society is launching a great new appeal on behalf of the Church schools. Its primary object, we understand, is to ensure the safety of the remnant whose fate at the moment hangs in the balance. We hope that the opposition which, we are told, is likely to be offered will be sufficient to arouse the fighting enthusiasm of the supporters of the schools. It is extraordinary that there should still be churchmen who doubt the importance of the issue. It is probable that they are living in the past and imagine that the religious interest that has been built up by the self-sacrifice of past generations will continue to be manifested by the State even if the Church shows no particular enthusiasm. Such a view is gravely mistaken. It is far more likely that the State would take due notice of our failure to respond to the challenge on this occasion, and when the issue arises again would entirely disregard our interests and needs. That the question will arise again is quite certain. When it does, in all probability an attempt will be made to put an end once and for all to the dual system. When that happens, if the Church is still recognized to have a large stake in the educational system of the country, we may be able to secure some *quid pro quo* such as a right of entry. If however we can be shown practically to have surrendered such claim as we have, we shall naturally be disregarded, and Church teaching will be effectively eliminated from the schools of the country. Can it be that any of the English clergy doubt whether that would be a disaster? They should consult their colleagues overseas. They would find that there is many a priest there who, if asked, would rank his schools higher in importance

than his church. Cogent reasons could be offered for such a view. In fact however the dichotomy is illogical. For a Christian community the school is part of the church. One understands that in Judaism school and synagogue were one and the same building. The same has often been true of the Christian church and school. But even where they function in different buildings the school is still the adjunct of the church. It is in the school that the Word is taught, and that each generation hands on to the next the revelation it has received from God. If we can think of our schools in this way, there should be plenty of response to the National Society's appeal.

EPISCOPAL-PRESBYTERIAN RELATIONS

E. L. MASCALL

In 1951 there was published, under the title *Relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland,* the report of a series of conversations between representatives of the two established Churches, in which representatives of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and the Presbyterian Church of England, while present in the capacity of "observers", were not technically parties to the discussions. It was felt at the time that there was something lacking in discussions held on the basis of establishment rather than of theology, and when in October 1952 the Convocations received the report they asked that the conversations should be resumed upon an Episcopal-Presbyterian rather than an English-Scottish basis. It is the report of these resumed and widened conversations that is now before us.* Rarely can any gathering have shown less anxiety for its findings to be implemented in a hurry. It explicitly asks

> that no action or decision be taken by the governing bodies of the four Churches immediately upon the presentation of our Report beyond commending it, as we hope, to careful study and examination by the Churches according to their constitutional procedure,[1]

and both the English Convocations and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland have acted on this recommendation. The remarks which I shall make here are intended as a modest contribution to the study and examination in question and make no claim to be conclusive or exhaustive.

The members of the Conference were firmly convinced of the need for a new approach. "In the present Conversations", they say

> we have renounced, and believe that the Churches concerned should renounce, the method of selecting and measuring such faults and

* *Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches. A Joint Report.* S.P.C.K., 1957, 3s. 6d.

> errors in the past history of the Churches now conferring as might be judged to be responsible for our present divisions. These matters have been investigated frequently, and complete agreement on them is not to be expected at this stage in history. It is acknowledged that mistakes have been made on both sides, and that over the generations attitudes tending to bitterness and strife have been not infrequent, but the time has come when the voice of mutual recrimination should be silent.[2]

The spirit of this is admirable, but the conclusion drawn is somewhat odd. It would seem to be clear that there is little hope of healing our divisions unless we examine the causes which led to them, and the acknowledgement that there were mistakes on both sides and that mutual recrimination should be abandoned would seem to offer an admirable opportunity for such an examination. Ten years ago the admirable, but disgracefully neglected, report *Catholicity*, which was drawn up by a group of Anglo-Catholic theologians at the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, maintained that the real cause of the disintegration of Western Christendom in the sixteenth century was to be found in certain late-medieval distortions which were so deeply ingrained that they were never consciously recognized and therefore persisted in post-Reformation Catholicism and Protestantism alike. The irenical atmosphere of the recent conversations would have been an ideal setting for dragging this medieval legacy into the light. The opportunity was, however, completely ignored and the Conference devoted all its attention to an attempt at synthetizing the post-Reformation positions. This may have been, as they asserted, "a more positive and, therefore, a more hopeful appeal to the past" than the method of mutual recrimination; the controversial method of Shimei is always unproductive. But it is fundamentally complacent and superficial, for it assumes that Catholics and Protestants in the sixteenth century were quarrelling about nothing at all, and this, when one thinks of the writings of the Reformers, seems, to say the least, unlikely.

"It is beyond doubt," says the Report,

> that God in his overruling providence and grace has been pleased to use and bless the witness of these Churches in and through the separate structures of their life, their divided ministries, and their distinctive worship. The full substance of this experience is to be preserved and brought into the Church of the future. . . .
>
> The governing principles of the Conversations have therefore

> throughout been the necessity of unity if the Lord's will for his Church is to be done, and the necessity of changes in both our historic Church systems if unity is to be effected.[3]

This is undoubtedly true, but the changes envisaged consist simply in adjusting Anglicanism and Presbyterianism to each other; no serious attention is paid to the possibility that a great deal of their common inheritance needs questioning too, and that until it is questioned the attempted adjustment will not be either successful or permanent. It is thus not surprising that in the course of the discussions serious problems arose. What is surprising, and indeed astonishing, is that those problems were deliberately by-passed. "We have made", says the Report,

> what we recognize to have been no more than an exploratory survey. In its course problems have been raised which we have deliberately set aside or not discussed to a conclusion, recognizing that the time for dealing with them will not be before the Churches resolve to go beyond the stage of "conversing" about unity and begin to plan it. Hence on many such matters, some of them presenting difficult problems, the present Report has necessarily either nothing to say or only tentative suggestions to offer.[4]

This is really amazing. It is perfectly reasonable, and laudably modest, for the Conference to admit that there were many important problems with which it was unable to deal. What is not either reasonable or laudable is for the Conference to have supposed that, having shelved these problems, it was in a position to attack what it considered to be its primary task, namely to answer the question: "Are there conceivable modifications and mutual adaptations of the two Church systems whereby they may be reconciled in such a plenitude of faith and order as will conserve the fullness of their traditions?"[5] In fact it got the cart completely in front of the horse, and the reason for this peculiar inversion is, I suggest, that having rightly resolved to abandon the method of mutual recrimination, it could see no other alternative than the method of mutual adaptation. This is the more reprehensible because a more profound, theological, and intellectually respectable way had already been pointed out ten years ago by the document *Catholicity*.

In my further remarks I shall not attempt to summarize the details of the Report, for it is to be hoped that readers of the *C.Q.R.* will read it for themselves. I shall merely indicate some of the points at which it seems to me to be unsatisfactory and which

one may hope will be dealt with in subsequent conversations.

As one would expect, the ministry provides the chief area of difficulty. "The whole Church as the Body of Christ", we are told, "participates in his threefold ministry as Prophet, Priest, and King."[6] We are then told that "all ministry in the Church is to be interpreted as a ministry of Christ to the Church, that is *from the Head to the Body as a whole*,"[7] and that "all ministry in the Church is to be exercised within the corporate priesthood of the whole Church".[8] The ministry here referred to is not the ordained ministry, but a ministry exercised by the Church as a whole, for the Report immediately goes on to say that "within this wider exercise of ministry there is a specific ministry of the Word and Sacraments to which by ordination some are set apart". The force of the words which I have italicized is very difficult to see; for how can the ministry which is exercised *by the whole Body* be a ministry *to the Body as a whole*? As the Epistle to the Hebrews makes plain, Christ's priestly function is directed not to men but to God: "Every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins . . . So Christ also . . ."[9] And 1 Peter makes the same assertion about the Church: "Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ."[10] Thus, if the priestly ministry of the Church is a participation in the priestly ministry of Christ, it is not, as the Report asserts, "from the Head to the Body as a whole", but through Christ to the Father; and the same must be true about the ordained ministry if this is, as the Report tells us, something existing "within" the wider ministry which is the corporate priesthood of the whole Church. The Report was here on the verge of a discussion of the ordained priesthood which would have led it into direct conflict with Protestant views of the ministry, but here, as elsewhere, the Report looks its difficulties bravely in the face and passes them by. We are told that the Conference gave much attention to the nature of the ordained ministry[11] but we hear little or nothing about its priestly character. What we do hear a great deal about is its function of "exercising *episcopé* or oversight".[12] It was frankly recognized that the ways in which this is exercised in Presbyterianism and in Anglicanism are widely different, but a scheme was outlined by which "over against the possibility of the acceptance of the 'historic episcopate' by the

Presbyterian Churches, there was set the possibility of the acceptance of a greater measure of 'corporate episcopacy' by the Anglican Churches".[13] Up to a point the scheme is such as Anglicans could accept without very much difficulty, though, as with other reunion schemes, it contains two unresolved problems. It is not made clear whether organic intercommunion would be instituted while there were still a number of Presbyterian ministers who, while they were now under episcopal oversight, had not received episcopal ordination, nor is it stated (though perhaps the answer is assumed) whether Anglicans would find themselves in communion *via* the episcopalized Presbyterians with non-episcopal bodies. The former of these points is connected with the fact that, while a good deal is said about the stress which Anglicans lay upon episcopal ordination in view of the bishop's relation to "the wider ministry of the Church Universal through the ages",[14] no clear distinction is drawn between order and jurisdiction and, in sharp contrast with the Reply of the English archbishops to Pope Leo XIII, nothing is said about ordination as conferring *character*, in the theological sense. If this distinction had been recognized it would have been possible to make more concessions to the Presbyterians in the realm of church order than the Report envisages. On something like the model of the ancient Irish church it would be possible to retain the government of the Presbyterian Church in its present form, using the bishops only for ordaining and confirming; Anglicans would not look upon this as an ideal arrangement but they could hardly denounce it as uncatholic. Unless the distinction between order and jurisdiction is clearly recognized, Anglicans are almost certain to demand for the bishop more in the realm of jurisdiction than they need and less in the realm of order than they ought. A further consequence is that the proposed changes in the Anglican and in the Presbyterian Churches are made to seem generically similar, whereas they are in fact generically different. The changes proposed in the Anglican Churches are all such as, if they wished, the Anglican Churches could bring about for themselves, for they are all changes in *organization*; the Presbyterians might have provided the model for them but no active intervention by Presbyterians would be required. The changes proposed in the Presbyterian Churches, on the other hand, are, at least in part, changes in *the nature of the ministry*; they are changes which the Presbyterian Churches could not bring about for themselves, and they require the active intervention of bishops who are in the historic succession. In fact, there seems to be

no reason to suppose that the Presbyterians would insist upon the changes being made in the Anglican Churches as a condition for full intercommunion; while, as the Report is forced to admit, "on the Anglican side, full intercommunion would be impossible without raising the question of Episcopacy as a thing deemed requisite for its fulfilment between the Churches, even if otherwise agreement had been reached as to doctrine and practice", since "the Holy Communion is . . . regarded as essentially integrated with the ordering and continuity of the Church and of its ministry".[15]

I have made the above comments in no spirit of hostility, but in the desire to help forward the movement towards unity. I have suggested that the conversations were weakened by a serious defect of method and also that certain matters of fundamental importance, in particular the theological nature of episcopacy and priesthood, did not receive a deep enough investigation. There is, of course, nothing to prevent their receiving it now. There is, however, a somewhat disquieting tendency in the Report to suggest that practical steps towards intercommunion ought to be taken while these questions are still unresolved. Thus we are told:

> Were the main tenor of the present Report to win the approval of the Churches, they might well be led to declare formally before God their intention to reach mutual assimilation, and to begin to seek ways and means of implementing that intention. A solemn resolve to achieve reconciliation and unity, accompanied or followed by decisive action with this end in view, would place the whole question of intercommunion in a new light. This question has normally been discussed in terms either of existing separations or of a fully realized unity. But such a solemn resolve would give a new significance to common participation in the Holy Communion, the sacrament of reconciliation and unity.[16]

This is not an entirely lucid statement and I am not altogether sure what it means. But if it means that acceptance of the Report would provide a satisfactory basis for intercommunion, I am convinced that it is gravely in error. "Problems have been raised," says the Report, "which we have deliberately set aside or not discussed to a conclusion, recognizing that the time for dealing with them will not be before the Churches resolve to go beyond the stage of 'conversing' about unity and begin to plan it."[17] I do not see how, until some of those questions have been thoroughly discussed, we can see what shape the plan ought to have or even whether a plan is possible. I suspect that our differences are much deeper than they

are generally supposed to be and that they will not be cleared up by the method of mutual adjustment but only by a serious investigation of their historical and theological origins. Dr D. M. Baillie's posthumously published work, *The Theology of the Sacraments,* is a model of courteous and charitable writing whenever its writer touches on the points at issue between Catholicism and Protestantism. But I doubt whether any Anglican can read it without a sense of dismay at the gulf which it reveals between the theological outlooks of the Calvinist and the Anglican tradition. He will find himself being told, for example, that the Incarnation is a thing of the past, that the Church is not its extension, and that the Sacraments of the Christian Church differ in no real respect from those of the Jewish. Such matters as these are not referred to in the Report, and we are left wondering whether they were among those which the Conference deliberately set aside or did not discuss to a conclusion. They are, however, fundamental to our understanding of the Gospel. In many respects the Report marks a considerable advance on others that have been produced under similar conditions. But perhaps its most valuable feature is the indication which it gives of the amount that remains to be done.

1 p. 18.
2 p. 6.
3 p. 7.
4 p. 7.
5 ibid.
6 p. 8.
7 ibid. (my italics).
8 ibid.
9 Heb. 5. 1-5.
10 1 Pet. 2. 5.
11 p. 9.
12 pp. 9, 10.
13 p. 12.
14 p. 14.
15 ibid.
16 p. 8.
17 p. 7.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY IN THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT: A SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL APPROACH

R. T. HALLIDAY

THE doctrine of the Ministry is the greatest—by no means the only, but by far the greatest—field of controversy in the ecumenical movement wherever that involves negotiations between the Anglican Church and non-Catholic Churches. The basis of modern Anglican discussion concerning reunion is to be found in the 1920 Appeal to all Christian People, in which the Lambeth Conference again set forth the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral which the Conference of 1888 had adopted:

> *VI.* We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:—
>
> The Holy Scriptures as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal Confession of belief.
>
> The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship, in and with Christ.
>
> A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

The Appeal goes on to claim that the historic episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry. Relatively little difficulty has been found in reaching agreement on the first three "sides" of the Quadrilateral. It is the fourth which invariably proves to be an obstacle. It is a great tragedy that this should be so, since the Catholic doctrine of the Ministry came to be formulated in order to safeguard Christian unity, and has come in our age to be an obstacle to it. The great immediate task of the Anglican Churches in the ecumenical movement is to commend the Catholic doctrine of the Ministry to those Christians who belong to Churches which do not

hold that doctrine, and who constitute about one-fifth of the Christian people of the world.

What is the Catholic doctrine of the Ministry? This is best seen by a study of the recent history of the doctrine in the Anglican Church. The modern emphasis can be said to begin with the Oxford Movement, and to have emerged from the revival of Patristic studies in the Movement. The doctrine was customarily referred to as that of "Apostolical Succession", and the gist of it was that the Apostles received their commission from our Lord, and were themselves the fount of the subsequent ministry of the Church, committing to bishops as their successors sacramental power to perpetuate their own order and to ordain men to derivative and subordinate orders of the ministry of the Church. The means whereby this sacramental grace was transmitted, from the Apostles to the bishops and from the first bishops to succeeding bishops and by them to their successors, was the laying on of hands.

This doctrine of Apostolical succession was asserted, for example, by John Henry Blunt in his *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology* of 1879, and he is able to quote a formidable array of Anglican divines in support. The renewed emphasis met with a storm of opposition. In the 1860s and 70s, when infallibility was being ascribed to the Pope by most Roman Christians, to the Bible by many Protestant Christians, and to science by all non-Christians, the Anglican Church was caught on the hop in the middle of the Catholic Revival. Some of the critics of the doctrine were hostile simply because they were opposed to the Oxford Movement, and can be largely discounted. There was also some honest criticism on historical grounds, notably from scholars of the Church of Scotland. In part the opposition came from scholars, including Anglicans, who were under Liberal influence in New Testament exegesis, and whose testimony fell with Liberalism; in part it came from Anglican scholars who were persuaded, like F. J. A. Hort, that it was wrong to erect a historical uncertainty into an article of faith. The recognition of the historical uncertainty of tactual succession became general, and is to be found, e.g., in Moberley's *Ministerial Priesthood* (1907) and in Hasting's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (1908).

It is important to take note of these approaches, for time and again Anglicans, even great Anglicans, are cited in support of this and against that, when in fact many of them were not regarded as

sound, *on the point at issue*, by their own contemporaries. Much less ought they to be quoted as representative of the Anglican Church, but the practice remains common. For example, at a conference of British theological students at Swanwick, early in 1955,[1] a Quaker speaker referred to Dr Hatch and Bishop Lightfoot in support of his contention that the Anglican Church had not in fact consistently maintained the Catholic doctrine of the ministry. Now Dr Hatch's Bampton Lectures of 1880, published under the title, *The Organisation of the Early Christian Church*, were written from an individualist standpoint from which the Church was seen as an association of individual Christians, a voluntary association to which not all Christians were bound. Centralization and organization are seen as subsequent developments not visualized by our Lord, and the later emphasis on authority, and on the vesting of authority in the Bishops, is inevitably seen as a fossilization. This whole view is no longer intellectually respectable. Not only so, but it stands quite contrary to that of Hort in his lectures of 1888 (later published as *The Christian Ecclesia*) and was expressly repudiated by Gore in his *Church and Ministry* (1886). Similarly, to take Lightfoot as representative in this respect is ridiculous. Lightfoot sought to take an approach that was historical, irenical, and academic in a time when approaches were dogmatic, polemical, and partisan, and deliberately avoided the question of the meaning and value of continuity in order to concentrate on the work of eliciting the history of the development of the ministry from the available documents. His dissertation on the Christian ministry, an appendix to his Commentary on Philippians, first appears in 1868. Lightfoot's fame rests on his being a pioneer, not a representative scholar. The last edition of this book was published in the year in which the Anglican Bishops adopted the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral.

Because of the freedom that has always been enjoyed by Anglican scholars it is possible to find almost anything maintained or opposed *somewhere* in Anglican literature. But it is high time people inside and outside the Anglican communion stopped trying to conclude from this *either* that all great Anglicans invariably express the mind of the Church, *or* that there is no such thing as the mind of the Church.

It is beyond dispute that the mind of the Anglican Church was convinced of the reality of the Apostolical Succession and of the necessity of the Apostolical Succession to the Church. It is also true,

as has been indicated, that as a result of continual debate and critical re-appraisal the Anglican Church came to the conclusion that there was not conclusive evidence as to the way in which that succession was transmitted from the Apostles to their immediate successors. It is by no means impossible that they *did* in general consecrate Bishops, but on the historical evidence of the New Testament and the Fathers, tactual succession is not proven. There is what has been called a "tunnel period" into which the Church enters about the end of the Apostolic age and from which it emerges about eighty years later. Within this period, c. A.D. 112, St Ignatius of Antioch refers to the threefold ministry of historic bishops, presbyters, and deacons as the norm. At the end of it, "Hegesippus and his contemporaries were convinced of the Apostolic origins of their local ministries".[2]

To avoid confusion, it is usual to refer to the older doctrine as that of Apostolical or Apostolic Succession, and the present doctrine (the transmission of the Apostolic ministry by uncertain means through the tunnel period) as that of Historic Succession. That the Apostolic ministry *was* transmitted, that it was intended by the Apostles to be transmitted,[3] and that it is a sacramental gift of God to his Church, which the Church dare not dispense with, is the belief of the Anglican Church.[4] Such a view is, we would submit, the only intelligible explanation of the fact that "from the second century onwards, the one chief minister of each local Church, known universally as '*episcopos*' is agreed to be the successor of the Apostles in all respects in which such succession is possible".[5]

What has modern scholarship to say about the historic episcopate? The first thing modern scholarship has to say is that the New Testament evidence is inconclusive. Clearly, for example, the Eleven are held in very high esteem in the Church. A scholar of the Swedish school at Uppsala has recently stressed the significance of John. 22, 23:

> Normally, the power to remit sins belonged solely to God; the very fact that the Messiah claimed to have this power was a scandal to Christ's contemporaries (Mark 2. 7). It must therefore have seemed all the more remarkable that Christ delegates to his disciples so crucial a function and that he delivered to them the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, the power to admit or to refuse to admit men to everlasting life (Matt. 17. 19; 18. 18).[6]

The very lowest estimate must credit the Evangelist with a very

"high" view of the Apostolate. But on the other hand, the word "Apostle" is not restricted to the Eleven[7] and does not seem to be a technical term in the New Testament.[8] Similarly the words "*episcopos*" and "*presbuteros*", while they are technical in that they seem to refer exclusively to ministers of the Church, are not defined over against each other, and seem in some instances to be interchangeable. As Professor J. K. S. Reid of Leeds said at Swanwick,[9]

> It is disappointing, if not surprising, that the establishment of the facts of the biblical record concerning the ministry leads, we will not say to such negative results, but at least to such ambiguous conclusions. It could hardly be otherwise. The Church is a living thing and operates in a situation which the very success of its mission was continually altering. The terms and titles which it employed at the beginning would at the very least have to be capable of being filled with supplementary meaning, to meet adequately the changing situation."

The Patristic evidence for the "tunnel period" is also, as has been seen, inadequate, and susceptible of various interpretations and strains. It is true that to some extent scholars of different denominations are influenced in their exegesis by the assumptions they hope to prove. It is also true that this argument can be overemphasized, and does not justify historical scepticism. Anglican scholars attach weight to the fact that when the early Church developed its doctrine of succession it read episcopal succession back into the tunnel period. Why? And how does it come about that they got away with this unchallenged? Did a passive and unresisting Church submit everywhere, without a single surviving protest, to the imposition of novel claims to authority by ambitious individuals? Or did the Apostolic ministry devolve swiftly and naturally upon the episcopate, as a development so spontaneous and evidently God-given that it was universally accepted as what was to be expected, universally received as the work of Christ in the midst of his Body the Church? The Church which emerges from the tunnel period is the same Church as the Church that went into it: living people were in touch with each other. The passage from generation to generation is not sudden and dramatic, but gradual, unspectacular, gentle. There is no ground whatsoever for presupposing revolutionary changes in the *paradosis* in the "tunnel period". Few indeed of the Christians who witnessed the martyrdom of St Justin in Rome would not have heard of the martyrdom of St Ignatius from an eye-witness; some of them must themselves

have been eye-witnesses of both martyrdoms. The life of St Polycarp seems to have spanned the "tunnel period", and St Irenaeus was a pupil of his.[10] "Irenaeus repeatedly states that Polycarp had received his tradition of faith from John, the disciple of the Lord, and other Apostles, and that 'apostles in Asia' had appointed him to his bishopric".[11] In view of the continuity of the life of the Church, and of the closeness of the links between the Christians throughout this period, any argument which assumes a radical change of standpoint must be recognized to be extremely implausible.

> By the end of the second century, in answer to the grave challenge of Gnosticism and to some extent of Montanism, the whole Church as such had become aware of the problems of authority and catholicity. Above all it claimed to be apostolic. To the Gnostics who boasted either to have discovered new truth or to possess secret traditions, and to the Montanists who believed that the revelation to and through the Apostles had been surpassed by the Paraclete's particular inspiration of their own prophets, the Church declared that it stood by the apostolic teaching summed up in the apostolic rule of faith, by the apostolic writings and in general by the tradition of churches founded by the apostles, churches with an unbroken tradition of faith and worship, a continuity with the apostles of which the succession of bishops was both a testimony and an instrument. This is the argument worked out by Irenaeus and Tertullian.[12] This apostolic Church is catholic both in the original sense of universal, spread throughout the world, the communion of all the apostolic sees and their daughter-churches, and also in the secondary sense, already in use by the end of the second century, of orthodox; and this apostolic and catholic Church is one. Only one visible body is the catholic Church, and wherever there are rival claims, that body which proves its apostolicity by the historical, outward, and therefore comparatively simple and verifiable test of the apostolic succession of its ministry, is, and alone is, the catholic Church.[13]

"It is noteworthy," says Professor Fairweather,

> that both the succession of the bishop to the teaching office of the apostles and his status as apostolic priest and pastor, along with the ordination of each bishop by the bishops of other churches (in other words, the essential points of the elaborated doctrine of apostolic succession), are taken for granted by Hippolytus in the third century, as the historic doctrine and practice of the Roman church.[14] The most striking fact of all, however, as far as the question of sacramental succession is concerned, is the complete absence from the first fifteen centuries of Christian history of positive evidence for the ordination

of bishops or presbyters by any one except an apostle or apostolic bishop. (With one theoretical exception, dating from the fifteenth century, the same seems to be true of the ordination of deacons).[15]

Thus the results of modern scholarship have been the modification of the doctrine and the strong confirmation of the modified doctrine. As the unity of the Church in the Apostolic age centred in and was expressed by the Apostles, so in the Patristic age it centred in and was expressed by the episcopate. And so far from differentiating between the Apostolic and episcopal ministries, the Church expressly identified them, and sought to connect them historically through the sub-apostolic age. While we may agree that the *form* which they assumed historical continuity to have taken is historically unproven, we must also surely agree that there was historical continuity with and of the Apostolic ministry, and that the Church very soon came to regard the historic ministry, which had devolved upon the episcopate, as vital. If it be objected that this crystallization of the form and doctrine of the historic ministry was a degeneration, we reply that nowhere in the literature of the Christian Church prior to the Reformation is such a view to be found, and never have the Churches which since then have retained the historic episcopate been able to take that view.

The historic episcopate and the ecumenical movement. Particularly in Scotland, the Anglican communion appears to other Christians to be "the Molotov of the ecumenical movement".[16] We appear to be negative, arrogant, and unrealistic—lost in ecclesiastical archaeology. At a conference of the Glasgow University Branch of the S.C.M. in the autumn of 1955 a Presbyterian student criticized the Anglican Churches for "saying things are good and right and true just because they are old". We seem to be fascinated by antiquity. Now of course we *do* respect Christian beliefs and practices instinctively when we know them to be old, not because of a fondness for mere antiquity, but because we believe that a practice that has been used and valued and hallowed by Christians (striving as we strive to live the Christian life) through the ages has to be respected as a sound practice unless we are convinced that it is wrong. We are conscious of the living continuity of the Church, and of the reality of the Church in the past, in a way that this student is not. The argument, "the Church has always believed so", has far more cogency among Scottish Episcopalians than it has among Scottish Presbyterians. The relevance of this difference to

the present problem is seen in the willingness of some non-Catholics to use or accept the argument that the three-fold ministry or the historic episcopate was an excellent institution for the needs of second century or of Mediterranean Christianity, but is "not appropriate" to the twentieth century or to Scotland. But of course the question is being begged. What is essential to the nature of the Church is essential to the nature of the Church in every place and in every age. If it be pointed out that the Church in the tunnel period did not have what the fourth century would have recognized as their episcopate, it must be added that neither had they the fourth century's canon of Scripture, concerning which no one seems willing to make corresponding deductions.[17]

We have seen that the answer of the Patristic Church to the claims of heretics and schismatics was "that it stood by the Apostolic teaching summed up in the apostolic rule of faith, by the apostolic writings, and in general by the tradition of churches . . . with an unbroken tradition of faith and worship, a continuity with the apostles of which the succession of bishops was both a testimony and an instrument". This is precisely the content of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral! Reviewing the situation, the Committee on Christian Unity reporting to the Lambeth Conference of 1930 observed: "In the non-Episcopal Churches we find that as regards three of the four points there is such a measure of agreement as to form a hopeful basis of further negotiation. . . . The outstanding point is the Historic Episcopate."[18]

Historic succession was one of the arguments brought against Calvin, and it infuriated him. "The pretence of succession is vain", he replied, "if posterity do not retain the truth of Christ, which was handed down to them by their fathers, safe and uncorrupted, and continue in it."[19] And in a sense he was right. The medieval Church had overlaid and to some extent obscured the Apostolic doctrine. and we are all agreed that the reformation of the Church was the will of God. But the historic ministry is part of the Apostolic heritage, too: the succession is part of the truth of Christ, and was held to be such by that Church which Calvin sought to reproduce. The doctrine and practice of the historic ministry were part of the faith and order of the Church before the canon of Scripture was finally fixed. Any attempt to reproduce the early Church as it was when it possessed the Scriptures as we know them must reproduce a Church

which held the historic episcopate and believed it to be of the *esse* of the Church.

There are indeed excellent historical reasons why the Reformed Church was unable to retain the historic episcopate, but to explain how it was lost is not to justify its continued repudiation by that Church.[20]

Clearly agreement on this point is a fundamental pre-requisite to Anglican participation in any Church union. But one unfortunate consequence of the prominence of the question of the historic episcopate is the tendency to discuss it *in isolation*, and when isolated it is easily caricatured. Thus T. M. Lindsay, writing in 1902,[21] could say that "Apostolic Succession, in the dogmatic sense of that ambiguous term, is the legal fiction required by the legal mind to connect the growing conception of the authority of the clergy with the earlier days of Christianity". This is quoted with approval by Professor G. D. Henderson (writing in 1950!).[22] It was a doctrine invented to reassure people in an age when the power of the clergy was on the increase! Is this not ludicrous? How many "legal minds" were there in the Church whose chief missionary agents were "workers in wool and leather, washermen, and persons of the most uneducated and rustic kind"?[23] How much legalism was there in that second century, the one century that is lit from end to end by the fires of martyrdom? The Church has been known to take a "legal" or "mechanical" view of ordination, but not in the second century.

The historic episcopate is *not* isolated in the life and teaching of the Catholic Church, and care must be taken in ecumenical discussion to present it in its proper context. For example, it seems to be believed quite widely by non-Catholics that the Anglican doctrine of the historic episcopate makes the Church depend upon the ministry. In a sense the Church does depend upon the ministry, as she depends upon the Sacraments. But the ministry is given to the Church, and is meaningless apart from the Church. The ministry is not a self-perpetuating caste—every priest was first a layman! It is from the body of the kirk, from the floor of the house, that men come forward for ordination.

> We cannot accept a conception of ordination which is exclusively hierarchical, as though the ministerial succession alone constituted the essence of the Church apart from any continuing body of the faithful, or, on the other hand, a conception which would make

> the ministry representative only of the congregation, or of the whole body of the laity, or, again, a conception which represents it as having its justification only in adminstrative convenience. The ministry is to be regarded as having its entire existence and significance within the life of the Body as a whole. The fact that the ministry does not derive its commission from a Church which initially had no ministry, but derives it, within the Church, from Christ Himself, the Head of the Church, His Body, does not involve the consequence that it can perform its function apart from the Body. Continuity of ministerial succession, though it is the pledge of unity and continuity in the sphere of Order, is not the only pledge of the unity and continuity of the Church's life.[24]

Ordination has to be the act of the Church. The laying-on of the hands of a Bishop in the historic succession is the God-given means whereby, *within* the Church, this act is performed in each case. Over against a "mechanical" interpretation of the doctrine, two points should be noticed. In the first place, the laying-on of the hands of a Catholic bishop does not automatically confer valid orders. This is to be seen in the case of consecrations and ordinations by Bishop A. H. Mathews, a Scottish Episcopal priest who received valid consecration from the Old Catholic Church in the Netherlands and proceeded to create an Old Catholic Church in Great Britain. His own orders are not in doubt, but the validity of those he conferred is, and such of his clergy as are received into the Church of England receive Catholic ordination *sub conditione*.[25] The second point is that a valid ministry itself is not to be regarded as constituting the fulness of the Church. The Committee on Unity reporting to the Lambeth Conference of 1948 said: "We are not satisfied that what has been described as 'Episcopacy *in vacuo*' would really give to the non-Episcopal Churches that which we or they would desire. In the section of the Report which deals with the Church of South India considerable emphasis has been laid on the fact that catholicity is something which involves more than the possession of an undoubtedly valid ministry".[26] This is a valuable reminder that the doctrine of the ministry is not the only point of difference and must not be treated as if it were.

A practical consideration, relevant also to the question of "unity or uniformity", is that insistence upon the historic ministry does not imply insistence upon the identical reproduction of the contemporary forms of that ministry in the Church of England. Obviously the practice and social status of a bishop in the Church of England

to-day are considerably different from those of a bishop in Asia Minor in the second century, and equally obviously the bishop in a united Catholic Church of Scotland is going to resemble the latter more closely than the former. Again, the present form of the diaconate in the Anglican Church is not satisfactory, and awaits transformation. But on the other hand, it was recently argued[27] that the picture of the bishop and his presbyter in the early Fathers is far more that of the Church of Scotland minister and his elders to-day than that of a contemporary Anglican diocese. This will be a practical issue of importance in a reunited Church, but is totally irrelevant to the present *ecumenical* issue. For the Anglican Churches are concerned, not with outward resemblance, but with inner identity—not with similarity, but with continuity.

This is the crux of the matter. Continuity is essential as well as spatial unity, and the historic episcopate is one of the God-given means of both. We are witnessing to truth in refusing to say that Churches which repudiate the historic episcopate are the Church in the sense we ourselves are. It is at this point that non-Catholics accuse Catholics of arrogance. And some Anglicans have been arrogant. But this is not a matter for arrogance. It is no merit of ours that our fathers preserved the historic succession. Nevertheless that is a fact, and a fact that must be reckoned with in the ecumenical movement.

Here, however, there is a flaw in Anglican logic. The Anglican Church says to the Protestant Churches, "You are not the Church in the sense that we are the Church". It has never said, "We are the Church and you are not". Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we cannot deny the necessity of the historic ministry; under the guidance of the same Spirit, we recognize clearly some of the marks of the Church in the separated Churches, and cannot deny that in some sense they partake of the nature of the Church. This is well put by Dr Lesslie Newbigin, who says the Catholics

> are in a dilemma. For in sharing in the ecumenical movement they have become involved in a situation for which their traditional theology has no place. The Catholic rightly believes that it is of the nature of the Church to be one visible fellowship, and if he is serious he must believe that his own Church is that fellowship. He cannot, then, treat other separated bodies of Christians as Churches. Yet in the World Council he has found himself compelled to recognise them as, in some sense, Churches, and therefore to join with them in a binding covenant. But his own traditional theological language can

> provide him with no categories to justify what he has done, and he will constantly appear to others as insincere or inconsistent. He maintains, for instance, that episcopacy is essential to the Church. This can only mean that where a body has no bishops it is no Church; that if it regards itself as a Church it is suffering from delusion; and that the only proper exercise of Christian charity towards its members is to deliver them from this delusion, and to bring them out of a pseudo-Church into the true Church. He repudiates that deduction because in the ecumenical movement he has come to know as a sheer fact that Christ is present in the other Churches. He cannot deny it without feeling that he is guilty of sinning against the Holy Ghost. The logical conclusion would then seem to be that he should correct the statement 'Episcopacy is essential to the Church' to 'Episcopacy is very valuable to the Church'. But he cannot do that without destroying his whole theological position. The Catholic is stuck in a logically impossible position. Yet by sticking to it he is defending a vital Christian truth which would otherwise apparently go by default.[28]

The ecumenical encounter of Anglican and Protestant can be put this way. The Protestant, exploiting our refusal to unchurch him, asks, "Is your historical episcopate really necessary?" The reason why we find this difficult to answer is that for us it is not a real question. It is comparable with asking, "Is the Bible really necessary?" It is the sacramental gift of God to his Church, and we accept it and use it joyfully as such, without speculating whether we could do without it. Suppose an Anglican province were deprived (by circumstances hard to imagine) of the Bible, but retained the historic ministry, the creeds, and the sacraments, would it be the Church? In a sense it would, and certainly God would not be prevented from pouring out his grace and working mightily in this Church. But it would not be the Church in the sense that it would be if it had the Bible, and could not be recognized as such if when the opportunity of restoration came it repudiated the Bible as unnecessary and Biblical authority as a fiction.

The practical difficulty is that it is hard for a Church which does not possess the historic ministry to see the relevance of our insistence upon it. As H. W. Montefiore says in his essay in *The Historic Episcopate*,[29] "the historic episcopate is a form of God's sacramental activity.[30] The fulness of its meaning can only be known from experience". Thus the Committee on the Unity of the Church reporting to the Lambeth Conference of 1948 said of the people of the Church

of South India, "They and their people will discover by living the life of a united Church things of which they had no experience before the union. The new bishops will increasingly discover what episcopacy is by exercising it in dependence on God with colleagues who were brought up in episcopal Churches".[31] In the Church of South India the historic episcopate has become once more a means of unity, instead of an obstacle to it.

The historic episcopate is being used by God in this twentieth century to call all Christian people into that truth, unity, and concord for which we in the Scottish Episcopal Church pray weekly, and in our Theological College daily, in the Holy Eucharist.

[1] The Conference on "Ministry and Mission", organized by the Theological Colleges' Department of the Student Christian Movement.

[2] E. R. Fairweather and R. F. Hettlinger, *Episcopacy and Reunion* (A. R. Mowbray and Co.), p. 19.

[3] John 17. 18 refers to the Eleven. In vv. 20 and 21 our Lord turns to "those who are to believe in me through their word". The unity of the Church is unity with the Apostles. Cf. Clement Rom. xliv and Professor C. C. Richardson's note in *Early Christian Fathers* (Library of Christian Classics, Vol. I) pp. 63-4.

[4] See *Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1930*, pp. 114-19, largely quoted in Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, III, pp. 7-10. See also *Doctrine in the Church of England* (1938), pp. 114-15.

[5] Professor E. R. Fairweather, op. cit., p. 17.

[6] Harald Riesenfeld in *The Root of the Vine* (Dacre Press, 1953), pp. 110-11.

[7] E.g. Acts 4. 14; Rom. 16. 7.

[8] See "Apostle" in *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, ed. Alan Richardson.

[9] See note 1, above. Professor Reid's three lectures have been published as *The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry*, S. J. T. Occasional Papers No. 4 (1955). This quotation will be found on p. 30.

[10] The silence of St Polycarp as to the historic episcopate is embarrassing to Anglicans, but is scarcely a conclusive argument against its existence in his time, and loses much of its force when the teaching of his pupil, St Irenaeus, is taken into account.

[11] Massey H. Shepherd, in *Early Christian Fathers*, p. 125.

[12] Irenaeus: *Haer.* III. 1-4, IV. 40; Tertullian: *De Praescriptione.*

[13] S. L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church* (S.C.M. Press), pp. 169-170.

[14] *Apostolic Tradition*, 2-6.

[15] Op. cit., p. 18. Professor Fairweather refers readers to F. E. Brightman in *Essays*, p. 402 n, and to T. G. Jalland in *The Apostolic Ministry*, on the questions of ordination to the diaconate and five alleged exceptions to the rule for presbyters.

16 The Provost of Perth (The Very Reverend W. B. Currie) at the conference of the Scottish Churches Ecumenical Association at Dollar in October 1956.

17 See G. L. Prestige on Tradition, in *Fathers and Heretics*, pp. 15-16 (1948 ed.).

18 *Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1930*, p. 114.

19 Inst. IV. ii 2 (Henry Beveridge's translation).

20 On the "high Presbyterian" fiction of "presbyteral succession", see C. B. Moss, *The Christian Faith*, Chap. 65, sections I and IV.

21 *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, p. 279.

22 *Church and Ministry*, p. 138.

23 Origen: *Contra Celsum*, iii 55 (tr. Professor John Foster).

24 *Doctrine in the Church of England*, p. 121.

25 See *Doctrine in the Church of England*, p. 134; H. R. T. Brandreth, *Episcopi Vagantes and the Anglican Church*, esp. p. 4 and Chap. II.

26 *The Lambeth Conference, 1948*, p. 54 (note, however, that this is the opinion of the Committee, and is not taken from the Resolutions passed by the Bishops).

27 By the Reverend David Lusk in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Sept. 1950.

28 *The Household of God* (S.C.M. Press), pp. 23-4.

29 p. 126.

30 On ordination as a sacrament, see *The Lambeth Conference, 1930*, pp. 134-5.

31 *The Lambeth Conference, 1948*, p. 42.

HENRY DESPENSER: THE FIGHTING BISHOP [1]

R. A. EDWARDS

HENRY DESPENSER was born in 1341 and he died, suddenly in Norwich Cathedral, aged sixty-five in 1406. He was born, that is to say, over six hundred years ago, and that is a very long space of time. It is necessary to begin with that kind of reminder because we are proposing to look back to a period when almost everything was completely different from anything with which we are familiar to-day, and because time in its passing seems to spread a romantic colouring over the past so that it is difficult to look back with clear eyes. It is said of a considerable Oxford philosopher that he never read history because he found it all completely incredible, and even if there is no need for us to adopt so far-reaching a counsel of despair, there is need for caution lest we read Despenser's story mistakenly. The problem is in the immense difficulty of appreciating the kind of world in which he lived. Let me remind you of two ways in which Despenser's world was outstandingly different from our own. First, there is the matter of its social structure. We seem finally to have lost the sense that society is a total thing, a unit so closely knit that each group and indeed each person has a loyalty to achieve and a contribution of duty to make to the greater whole. The feudal system with its oaths of homage, its picture of society as a kind of pyramid broadening down from the Pope and the King to the commons, seems very strange to us, indeed so foreign that in certain circles its very name has become almost a term of abuse. No doubt it was never a fully successful method of ordering human life, and part of Despenser's story will compel us to see that life pressed hardly, very hardly, upon the lower stages of the pyramid, but at least it meant that there was in society a doctrine of human responsibility. We have altered all that; modern society has broken up into innumerable groups, labour and capital, university and the others, even "U" and "non-U", and the groups struggle against each

[1] A paper read at the Norwich Diocesan Clergy School, 1957.

other. Whether our way is or is not an improvement upon Despenser's is irrelevant. We need only fairly to note the difference, lest we find ourselves judging him and the men of his time by our different view of social life.

Or again, we have to note that in the fourteenth century everyone was a Christian, and then that meant, of course, a churchman. We can be sure that most of the people only went to church occasionally, and some of them only very occasionally; we have no reason to suppose that taking them by and large medieval men were more devout than ourselves. But at least no one then thought of Christianity as an outworn superstition; no one regarded the Christian sacraments as foolish; no one was indifferent to Christian burial; no one doubted that after this life there was the judgement. It may not have been a good world, but it was a Christian world. If we have undone the social fabric of Despenser's world, we have also undone the idea of a single Church, a single Christian society, and undone it so effectively that to-day it is unlikely that anyone knows just how many religious sects there are in England. There are signs of a growing feeling that we have mishandled our Christian heritage, but the fact that we have done so makes it difficult to realize that Despenser would have regarded as his main duty the daily *opus Dei* in the Cathedral; indeed he was actually engaged in that work when he died.

We first hear of Despenser as fighting in the Papal wars in Italy. What took him out there no one knows. He was one of the family which had acquired an unhappy prominence in the time of Edward II. Also he was a Canon of Salisbury. It was not unknown for such an office to have been held by a layman, and so he may not have been in Orders, but when we come to what happened to him it does look as though he may have been. Possibly, giving weight to his royal connections and to his presumed Orders, he may have gone to Rome on some kind of mission, or, and this is just as likely, he may simply have gone out to visit his brother, a leader in the Papal forces then, as almost always, struggling to secure some kind of peace in the Papal dominions which were constantly under attack from the surrounding city States. At any rate he joined his brother, and the fame of his fighting reached England, though so far as the records go it was fame without details. We have to accept the fighting, and reconcile ourselves to the fact that until modern times Christians have been soldiers as comfortably as laymen.

What came of the fighting was an astonishing turn in Despenser's fortunes, for in 1370, when he was twenty-nine, the Pope gave him the bishopric of Norwich, consecrated him, and sent him home. Obviously there must have been more to him that just his fighting qualities, for the Pope, Urban V, was neither a bad man nor a fool. In fact he was one of the better Popes of his age, and he must have seen in the young man something that qualified him for the episcopate. The appointment lost him a soldier, and his extremely difficult military situation made a good soldier rather more important from the Papal point of view than an English bishop. True, as the chroniclers suggest, the Pope may simply have been cheaply paying off a soldier; but on the other hand Urban may have thought the man would make a good bishop. I think he should have the benefit of that doubt, for it turned out a good choice, and for the next thirty-five years Despenser was in and about his diocese, where he earned widespread respect and affection. A few years after his death he was described as "a man of very generous, charitable, and cheerful spirit", a note which too many modern writers have overlooked.

But the historians have had to do their work under a handicap. The chroniclers of the time were all monks, and Despenser had no sooner reached Norwich than he became involved in some dispute with the convent which lasted no less than fifteen years, at the end of which the monks had to pay him 400 marks if they were to continue to enjoy their privileges. Blomfield, the Norfolk antiquarian, did not know what the dispute was about, and my own search has been just as fruitless, but I suspect that it was something to do with fees on his enthronization. Fees were, and remain, an unpopular exaction, and the Bishop, who would have had to pay handsomely to Pope, King, and Archbishop for his see, may have been over-hard when it came to recouping himself from the monks. At any rate that seems to be why the chroniclers disapproved of him. In fact they as good as ignored him, and when mention of him had to be made it was done with marked brevity and even with evident dislike.

The trouble which arose with the town of Lynn is an excellent case in point. It was not King's Lynn then, but Bishop's Lynn, which meant that the Bishop was the Lord of the Manor, and that was then far from being the empty title that it is to-day. There would be

fees and dues of various kinds and possibly certain appointments in the Bishop's hands. Once more Blomfield was unable to discover what it was all about; the incident is in all the chronicles, but the cause is not. Was it suppressed because to reveal the cause might have shown the Bishop in a good light, whereas what happened did not? Probably Lynn had tried to assert that its charter, dating from King John, made it a royal borough, in the hope that a Lord in Westminster might be easier to deal with than one in Norwich. However, the Bishop would have none of whatever it was, and demanded that his rights in the town should be acknowledged by the borough's staff being carried before him when he was in the town. The burgesses refused, and there was a riot in which not only the Bishop's men but himself and his horse were pelted with stones by the townsfolk so that they had to withdraw in a most undignified fashion. Now listen to a chronicler: "Thus the glorious pride of this jolly prelate ruffling in his new sceptre was received and welcomed there . . . and all running away from him, and the poor wounded Bishop was there left alone, not able to keep his power which went about to usurp a new power more than to him belonged; thus as it is commonly true in all, so it is well exemplified here, that Pride will have a fall and Power usurped will never stand." There seems to be a touch of bias there. But not only did the county families and legal authorities at Cambridge support the Bishop, but when the case went to the King in Council it was decided for him, and Lynn had to give way. The affair, annoying as it must have been to the Bishop, might seem trivial to us unless we fully recognize that feudal society was a very closely compact structure. The towns had their part in it, owing homage and loyalty, with various rights and dues, to an over-lord. Lynn was then a highly prosperous port, and we guess that with the prosperity there had come a desire to assert its independence of the local lord, and the Bishop would feel that a weakening of his position was socially dangerous, while at the same time he would have a wholesome fear of any undue growth in the wealth and power of the Crown. The social structure being what it was, an attempt by the local landlord, in this case the Bishop, to preserve his rights was not mere pride.

All that was in 1377, and four years later in 1381 the Peasants' Revolt broke out and society was very seriously threatened. We are correct in regarding it as an upsurge of very unhappy people. The

feudal system should have given a satisfactory life to the land workers upon whom as the base of the social pyramid the whole structure rested; but human nature being what it is, the exploitation of the economically weak was really inevitable, and the poverty, the insecurity, and even the degradation of the land-workers is plain enough in the literature of the time. Similar conditions in our day have democratically produced the Welfare State, but in 1381 they produced rebellion. We are not concerned with the details of the revolt, but in passing we may remark that its organization seems to to have been astonishingly competent, for the message, "John Ball has rung your bell", brought the workers out in great numbers over a wide area of England in a few weeks, and sometimes in a few days. The leaders—in our area Geoffrey Lidster—cannot have been the uncouth ruffians depicted by the chroniclers, who in their rich monasteries were as frightened of John Ball, as, shall we say, the *Daily Telegraph* is of Aneurin Bevan. Another comment is worth making. The rebels felt that they had religion on their side. Their jingle, "When Adam delved and Eve span who was then the gentleman?" cut uncomfortably near the knuckle. English revolutions do seem to have been like that—a Bible in every rebel's knapsack. But we are concerned with East Anglia and Despenser.

When he heard that Lidster was mustering a considerable force he was at the Palace, and he rode hard to his manor at Burleigh near Stamford where he hoped to be able to raise some kind of support. He got about eight horsemen and a company of archers, and with them hurried towards Norwich. Near Newmarket he came on some of the Suffolk rebels, who cannot have been expecting him from the West. He left the heads of two of their leaders on spears in Newmarket, and in his rush towards Norwich he hanged others. Lidster, who had taken Norwich, where, intentionally or not, the Mayor had been killed, withdrew towards a semi-fortified camp near North Walsham. By this time the county gentry, inspired by the Bishop's example, were arming, and when the Bishop moved out towards the rebels he had a fair-sized force with him. What happened seems to have been a head-on charge led by the Bishop, and the commons were completely routed at a spot marked still by a roadside cross on the Norwich side of North Walsham. No doubt to our way of thinking the whole affair seems strange, but we should remember that we are considering a very different world from ours, a world where a bishop would see himself as responsible

for the total peace of his diocese rather than being solely concerned with its spiritual welfare. Also of course, there was Dispenser's experience of soldiering in Italy—he would feel that he was called to the kingdom for such a time as this, and even the chroniclers have grudgingly to record his achievement.

But what happened next was even more extraordinary. Lidster was taken in some nearby woodland, and, now acting as judge in the King's Court, Despenser tried him in North Walsham. The condemnation and the sentence were alike certain. He was guilty of taking arms against the King's peace, and as a traitor caught red-handed he must be drawn, hanged, and quartered. But the victorious general and judge in the King's court was at the same time the Bishop of Norwich, so Despenser took Lidster over to St Nicholas Church, and there heard his confession and absolved him. He knew how a man should be prepared for death, and just as he had refused to delegate the military leadership or the responsibility of the trial, so now he undertook the last preparation himself. The total action argues a high sense of responsibility in Despenser, and what he did next suggests perhaps that he liked Lidster or at least regarded him as an honourable man worthy of credit. He had to be dragged at the cart's tail to the place of execution, and Despenser went with him holding up his head to spare him the horrid bumping on the rough road. I confess that I find myself greatly moved by the thought of the Bishop stumbling along behind the cart while he supported the head of the man who must die for his dreams.

It is clear that we are considering a most unusual man, but if we would judge him correctly we need to think very accurately about the Peasants' Revolt. Instinctively we to-day are on the side of the peasants; their grievances were only too real. But at the same time we have to see that John Ball was centuries in advance of his time. His jingle about Adam and Eve has not even yet been accepted as a valid comment upon social life, and in the fourteenth century such ideas implied a complete reconstruction of society. The feudal system was slowly wearing itself out, but in the fourteenth century the triumph of John Ball would have meant chaos, and we are still not quite sure that we can steer through our own social revolution without serious dislocations. Despenser was acting within the wisdom of his time, and it is very much to his credit that he did what he could to mitigate Lidster's terrible end. At the time his bold action won him great renown, and the county families presented

to him the magnificent reredos which, after hardly escaping the Puritan iconoclasts, stands in the ambulatory of the Cathedral, and whose restoration as a reredos is now being undertaken by the Friends of the Cathedral. Despenser was not a brutal man. In 1399 he had to try William Sawtre for heresy, but, perhaps with the help of the dungeon which is still impressive in the Palace, he got him to abjure his errors. Sawtre then took himself off to London where he lapsed and was burnt at Smithfield.

Despenser was an interesting and, as I have said, unusual bishop, and each epithet received astonishing justification two years later. The tenure of the Papacy was in dispute. Our Roman brethren tend to slip away from the numerous aberrations that have attended the somewhat chequered history of the Vicar of Christ, but at this moment there were two duly elected Popes each competing for the allegiance of the faithful. Such a situation was difficult in two very practical ways. On the one hand the Pope was the culminating point of the social pyramid, for ultimately all land and every crown was held by a title deriving from him, and two claimants at once put every contract in question. That was one side of it. On the other hand the Papacy was simply one of the political States which were constantly manoeuvering for power in Europe, and any decision about which should be supported when there was more than one claimant was made on no principles of right or wrong, but, precisely as is the case in our own time, according to what statesmen judged to be the expediency of the moment—in diplomacy right or wrong serve only to decorate a *fait accompli*. There was an Urban and a Clement, and when the former sent his Bull to Despenser, whose reputation was European, to raise troops in his support, England, observing that the French were supporting his rival, promptly confirmed the Bull. Amid scenes of wild enthusiasm the Bishop found himself the leader of a crusade supported with the same indulgences that in a former age had blessed adventurers in the Holy Land. Money poured in; women denuded themselves of their jewellery to help the cause; the crusade was preached up and down the country; Parliament, somewhat reluctantly, made a grant, covering it with the provision that the Bishop should himself pay the most of the transport; and in April 1383 Richard II authorized the pressing of ships and men for the invasion. So with great acclamation the Bishop arrived with his force in Calais, and there for the moment the expedition came to a halt.

It seems to have been one of those military enterprises, with which England is not altogether unfamiliar, whose command and indeed whose precise objective is not quite clear when the adventure begins. The Bishop had been appointed by the Pope to lead the crusade, but the King, possibly feeling that the support of the nobility was more valuable than that of the Bishop of Norwich, appointed Sir William Beauchamp as Marshall of the expedition. Unfortunately he was unable to leave with the crusading army, and whether the Bishop simply grew tired of waiting in Calais for him, whether he thought that by delay he was losing the advantage of surprise, or whether he wished to assert the validity of his own appointment, are questions that are now beyond answer. What happened was that he suddenly moved into Flanders. When we remember that the Flemings were Urbanists to a man, the unprovoked attack seems uncommonly strange. What the Bishop appears to have argued was that as the French, his proper enemies, had recently conquered the Flemings, for him to collect their conquest would at least be a blow in the right direction. It is also at least possible that as a Norfolkman he may have seen that the attack would be a suitable reprisal for the raids which the Flemings were constantly making on the East Anglian coast. It was a tricky piece of arguing, and Urban must have wondered just how it had come about that his crusaders were attacking his loyal supporters. The army swept forward. A whole series of towns were successfully taken, many casualties were inflicted on the Flemings, and much booty fell to the crusaders. Soon a large area of Flanders was in the Bishop's hands, and he settled down to besiege Ypres.

By then trouble was brewing at home. John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, had at that time a project in hand for an invasion of Portugal with an eye on at least a couple of crowns for his family; the Flanders affair, strange as it may seem to us, was so popular in England that the Duke's enterprise had to be postponed, and the force that should have been his was designated as reinforcements for the Bishop. They were much needed, for the army seems to have been singularly ill-found, a calamity with which also we are not unfamiliar, and it was being greatly handicapped by casualties and disease. "Time-honoured Lancaster" simply retarded the reinforcements and supplies. Inevitably the siege of Ypres had to be raised, and the troubled army rapidly fell back upon first one and then

another of its captured towns, until finally it returned to England in disgrace.

John of Gaunt was now out for the Bishop's blood. Several of his officers were clapped in the Tower, and the charge was spread abroad that the expedition had been sold. The Bishop easily cleared himself of that charge, though regrettably several of his officers were less fortunate, but when Parliament met he found himself having to answer to the Chancellor on a formidable indictment. He had undertaken to serve for a year, but was back within six months "with his host spoiled"; he had agreed to "muster and show his force" at Calais and had not done so; and he had not accepted the leaders appointed by the King. He appeared in person, and from the summary of his answers seems to have given a straightforward account of the expedition, and of its failure due to the non-arrival of the reinforcements, and to the loss of many men "by dint of sword and diseases". The Chancellor reluctantly abandoned the idea that it might be possible to proceed against him as a temporal lord (the Papal appointment was too clear for that), and he had to content himself with judging his reply insufficient and ordering his temporalities to be sequestrated. However, the Bishop of Ely, the redoubtable Arundel, outfaced the Chancellor and secured the reversal of the decision by the King, and there, but only for the moment, the matter rested.

One might have thought that by then the Bishop would have had enough of the crusade, but in 1386, that is, a year after his temporalities had been restored, with a small group of nobles he actually fitted out a fleet, and lay in wait for the Flemish wine ships from La Rochelle. We must presume that he supported the justice of the remarkable enterprise with similar arguing that had warranted his attack on Flanders—the French, supporters of the wrong Pope, had conquered Flanders, therefore the capture of wine bought by the Flemings from the French injured his proper enemies. In the event they captured a hundred ships, so that wine had never before been so plentiful in England, or so cheap. At the same time they raised the siege of Brest and fortified the town. Altogether a very odd episode, for which the King forebore to thank the Bishop, though it seems to have greatly increased his popularity. However, John of Gaunt, perhaps disturbed by the Bishop's prowess on "the moat and silver sea", was still out for the Bishop's blood, and had him arraigned in the Court of Chivalry for the recovery of the cost

of the crusade, a matter of some £37,000. The case dragged on, a Commission was appointed, but in the end the Bishop succeeded, and in 1391 obtained from the King a general discharge and a pardon for all offences whatsoever. That was the close of the business. But what are we to say about it?

It is, I confess, tempting to follow all the historians and to use the word "reprehensible", but to do so would be to judge it by standards which at no stage played any part in what was done. John of Gaunt, eager as he was to punish the Bishop for interfering with his ambitions for his family, never suggested that there was anything morally amiss with the attack on Flanders. It looks more as though, apart from his personal irritation, Gaunt feared, and probably it was a fear shared by the King, that the Bishop was becoming dangerously popular. It is we of the modern liberal tradition who say "immoral", for we tend to suppose that there is a much closer alliance between morals and international politics than is in fact the case, and this adventure is by no means the only incident in our history about which moralists may feel that a veil of forgetfulness needs to be drawn over our affairs. England, we may be sadly sure, drank the wine with a good heart and toasted the Bishop's successful piracy.

He was shortly to find himself in a position where his great popularity would stand him in good stead. The modern English bishop who expresses pronounced political opinions may comfort himself with the thought that the worst that may happen to him is that he may find himself out at elbows with not more than about half his diocese. The Tower does not loom over him with its frightening shadow. But in the fourteenth century things were very different. In 1398 John of Gaunt died; Richard, poor as the rest of the medieval monarchs, seized his estates, and went off to conduct one of England's periodic attempts to reduce Ireland, then as always an exasperating source of trouble. Henry Bolingbroke, the new Duke of Lancaster, arrived off the English coast with, among others, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Sir Thomas Erpingham. The Regent, the Duke of York, hurried off to Wales to meet Richard hastily summoned back from Ireland, and Despenser loyally rushed off to join him. By that time the gentry were flocking to Bolingbroke, and, among other cities, Norwich declared for him, thus adding a complication to Despenser's position. York could only raise a trivial force which was quite unable even to hold Berkeley

Castle. Richard was taken, and so was the Lord Bishop of Norwich. Consider his position. Bolingbroke on account of his long and acrimonious dispute with his father John of Gaunt had no love for him; while good old Sir Thomas Erpingham, whether he was himself a Lollard or not, was married to one of them, and the Bishop was notorious for his opposition to heretics. It must have seemed clear to Despenser that he stood small chance of favour with the new King. Nevertheless the extraordinary fact is that Bolingbroke discovered that he dared not proceed against the Bishop; his standing with the people was too secure for such a course even to be considered, and he was set at liberty. However, Sir Thomas Erpingham attempted in Parliament to force Henry's hand in the next year; but by that time Henry knew just how things stood, and though he told Sir Thomas that he recognized that his charges proceeded from his well-known zeal for his person, he extended a complete general pardon to the Bishop for all misprisions done against his person. What followed was extremely odd. The bishops, having thanked Henry for the honour done to their brother of Norwich, asked him to persuade the Bishop and Sir Thomas Erpingham to set aside their old quarrel and in open Parliament to kiss and shake hands. The two men agreed, and we may wonder if Parliament has ever seen anything stranger than these two elderly gentlemen publicly and solemnly making friends. We may also sadly wish that in modern times Parliament might find something so useful and so homely with which to occupy its time. The friendship proved lasting, and Sir Thomas showed himself a benefactor of the Cathedral; the suggestion that his Gate was built as a kind of penance is quite baseless—it was in fact not built until fourteen years after Despenser was dead.

Though he was then only fifty-nine, that scene in Parliament in February 1400 was the Bishop's last national appearance. He returned to his diocese and remained there. He had enjoyed the curious and very rare experience of having become a legend in his lifetime. He was "the Fighting Bishop" or "the warlike Bishop of Norwich". But we should remember that he held the see for thirty-five years, and that at the most his fighting occupied no more than five of them. In the intervals of his spectacular appearances on the public stage, he was in and about his diocese treating his fundamental vocation as seriously as he did the national demands which occasionally interrupted it. He was a good bishop, and even if there

were no other evidence upon which that judgement might be rested, I suggest that it could stand very securely on the record on his monumental brass.

Now there are one or two points about Despenser's brass that we need to have in mind. There were no immediate relatives to attend his funeral and after the reading of the will to record their gratitude. He even died intestate. No one had to make the best of what he had been. A line or two with the dates and a simple request for the prayers of the faithful would have passed without adverse comment. There was no one to wear down the resistance of the incumbent or to appeal against him to the Advisory Committee. Further, authority in the Cathedral passed on his death automatically to the Prior. This was the beloved Alexander Tottington, whom the Convent, in defiance of the rights of the Crown and the Pope, elected Bishop within a month of Despenser's death. He had been Prior for the past twenty-four years, and must have known the Bishop quite intimately. Nothing could be done in the Cathedral without his authority, and any inscription to the late Bishop would have had to pass his scrutiny. We can agree that such inscriptions have not always been truthful; but in this case there was no reason for anyone to lie, for even if public opinion might demand some ostentation, ingenuity could have achieved that without any unreasonable perversion of the facts. The brass is gone now, perhaps melted down in the Wars of the Roses or the Stuart troubles, perhaps just looted, and we should know nothing of it but for the odd fact that someone copied the inscription into the margin beside the life of Despenser which John Capgrave included in his book of "Illustrious Henrys" which he presented to Henry V. Here it is, just loosely Englished:

> Henry Despenser, the beloved soldier who was consecrated Bishop of Norwich, a flower of the royal stem, lies here. He was a doughty champion of the Church, who put schism to flight, damned the evil ways of the Lollards, and suppressed rebels. The spirit of this good shepherd passed to heaven during Mattins while reciting "The earth is the Lord's" on the Vigil of St Bartholomew in the year of our Lord 1406.

There are two phrases in that epitaph which must at once attract the attention of anyone who tries to explore the character of this remarkable man. "Beloved soldier", *miles amatus*, is very striking. *Amatus* is so unexpected that it suggests truth, for why should

Tottington bother with an extravagant lie when almost any other non-committal word, gallant, honourable, famous, what you will, would have served his turn? Or again, there is "the soul of this good shepherd", *boni pastoris mens*. I admit that it is much closer to common form than the *miles amatus*, but if it had not been true how easily could some less committing language have been used! I suggest that to us of the clergy, men who are highly qualified in this strange field of study, the language, especially the *amatus*, indicates that the tribute should be taken at its face value. And there is one other reason. The Cathedral was not then as it later became, presumably because of the appropriate fees, the burial place of all and sundry, and Despenser was buried in the most honourable place, before the High Altar on the right hand of the Founder.

I should like to think that I have persuaded you to share my high regard for the man. I agree that at any period of our history he would have been reckoned a most unusual man; I agree that it is not easy to imagine a modern English bishop doing the things Despenser did—piracy on the high seas and episcopal gaiters, I confess, go ill together. Should you suggest that I have allowed myself to be deceived by the glamour of a romantic past, I must refer you to the brass with its "beloved soldier" and its "good shepherd", and say that I like him enough to wish that someone with money to spare would restore his brass to the Cathedral. It is good to know that the death that came suddenly on him found him engaged in the *opus Dei*, that work for which the Cathedral was built, and with the glorious twenty-fourth Psalm in his ears. I like to think of the gates of God lifting for him—perhaps there was someone on the night watch who would understand the strange man and pass him in.

THE TWO BACKGROUNDS OF FAITH

FR HUGH, S.S.F.

In a Christendom not yet half-submerged, both belief and disbelief are still provocative sentiments to indulge. And yet, while keeping our sense of their importance, we have lost the power of considering them. Even when the desirability of faith is challenged, the exchange of discussion soon collapses into a small-scale Babel of two voices. Communication ceases. Either side is made obscurely aware that it has taken for granted or even perhaps assumed, without knowing, what the other has never conceived. This is partly the effect and partly the cause of our presuppositions' becoming the scene of that perhaps too much explained-away conflict between religion and science which though little noticed is still quietly disruptive.

Even if these presuppositions, which form discussion's inescapable background, are also faith's stumbling-block and foolishness, not all hope is gone. They can still become its power of God.

It is futile to ignore them or to hope to abolish them, for they are the springs of a man's thinking. Even unnamed and undreamt of, they keep a man intelligible to himself and hopeful of communicating himself to others. Indeed one fairly clear example of these shadowy things appears in the way men will express themselves in trying to persuade others. In time past, they have proclaimed, like the prophets of Israel; or used rhetoric, like the Greeks; or, like the Fathers, pegged out their allegories with texts of Scripture, in writings which the Schoolmen used in lumps to catapult at their opponents with logic. We now choose something different: for variety, ridicule, or sheer statement, or sympathy; but in general we have surrendered to that one method which the writer has just used. We draw an opinion from examples before us and try by reason to develop a rule that shall draw both these and any apparent exceptions into a unity. Consciously or unconsciously we adopt the scientific method that the seventeenth century popularized: to establish credibility a man shall observe occur-

rences, classify, create a hypothesis, test this by experiment and convert it into the form of some law from which logical steps can be made.

This comparatively new approach is now so automatically adopted that men can find it hard to imagine another. In a religious discussion, the lay Englishman will almost certainly choose it. Its unique validity is his presupposition.

A graver presupposition defines the question thought most worth asking. A child will sooner or later inquire, Who made me? But the interesting question is rather the second one. Usually it is, How? Not because the child is unconsciously a biologist. He may be. But he is always, if unknowingly, a worshipper first, and the question he means to frame is, Why? He cannot yet because he cannot conceive any answer. He has had enough experience of the way things are made, but has not stood still long enough in reflective thought to be troubled by the problem why a thing should have come to be made—until now. And now his first question reveals that Why is what he is setting out to resolve, if he only knew how to frame it. So that one catechism at least is directly to the point when it begins, Who made you? God made me. Why did He make you? . . . How, is the easier question; Why, is the more fundamental.

But How is also the commoner. Not only because it *is* easier, and more apt for earning daily bread, and therefore more often asked and answered in schools; it is safer, too. A man who, like Nicodemus, would discuss religion, will continually return to ask how such things can be, because he knows subconsciously that the answers to the other will prove awkwardly disturbing. How, leads him into a world of laws for him to master; Why, drives or lures him into a world of meaning that masters him.

This preoccupation with law is as modern as the scientific method, and it too, no doubt, came in behind Newton and Descartes. The medievals concerned themselves with meaning, which they would extort from anything. A single absurd example shall serve to show how both can be the roosting-place of presuppositions. A bird with so vast a double chin as the pelican could by no contortion reach its own breast. But the thirteenth century ignored this in favour of the legend that the bird drew blood from its breast with its own beak to feed its young. For so doing it became a type of Christ, clear in meaning and as clearly ordained to be the

symbol of him in the new festival of Corpus Christi. Anyone who had ever seen a hungry fledgling could understand the meaning of the Eucharist. Similarly, the early twentieth century felt that "a wonderful bird is the pelican", but to another conclusion. With observation more or less accurate and a mild fumbling after hypothesis, it of course continued:

> His beak holds more than his belly can.
> He holds in his beak
> What he eats in a week.
> It's a wonder to me *how* the hell he can!

Foolish as they are and perhaps just because they are so, these illustrations do point the effect of presuppositions. Scientific definition and religious apprehension, the two worlds of law and of meaning, where they touch seem to refuse to meet. And yet faith, if it is faith in an incarnation, holds that they not only meet but somehow coinhere. The possibility of faith rests upon a practical union of the two; and the question is really the old Christological one: What is the nature of the union? But we must first find out why they seem to refuse to meet; and the illustration may warn us that the refusal is the effect of some unconscious preconception.

If we turn first to the scientific world, we find the strength of science in the presence of law. Neither law nor hope of law, and there is simply no science. The more lawless sciences like psychology, economics, and meteorology are strong where phenomena have been reduced to law; and survive their weaknesses in the hope of extending the reach of law.

But what do we mean by law? In the fields of science or the knowledge of creation we use the one word for two contrasted things: law of creation, and law of nature. The laws of creation are the powerful decrees, uttered and effective. Altered, they would alter the thing created. They express the Will that calls into being and sustains creation. They imprint form and specific nature. God gives himself through them, we say, because we are unable to foretell or define them. By grace of revelation we receive a few of their corollaries, such as that we and the world exist. In contrast to these powerful laws which effect what they utter, are the laws of nature. These effect nothing; altering them does not disturb creation. They record and predict, and must rather follow the given shape of things than create it. The laws of nature are paths of consistency

through man's experience, recording and elucidating the past or the near at hand, so as to predict the future, or explore the distant, or perhaps provide the ground for the new hypothesis.

The laws of nature are conceived in man's mind by intuition or by deduction, through faith grounded in those unprovable corollaries of the laws of creation. Only after this intuitive moment are they purged and elaborated by rigorous observation, experiment, and induction. The truth so established is somewhat like a spark, sharply bright at its first appearing and quickly dull. The scientist's attention moves on to new hypothesis. The law itself is accepted and insensibly becomes a scientific belief. Fortunately the scientist has in the intractability of his material a safeguard against wrong belief. Eventually error appears. Three times the error between the observed and the calculated orbit of what had been thought the outmost planet challenged and then re-established the law by the discovery of a further planet. On the other hand, the refusal of the inmost to obey Newton and Kepler brought Einstein to develop the Special and then the General Theory of Relativity and amend the law. Even so, Mercury remains a little disobedient—enough to open a door for thought and discovery. For it is the unfortunate tendency of an established law to prevent further question. Great danger therefore ensues if ever some established law of nature is transferred to religion and allowed to fossilize there away from the tides of scientific comment.

The fate of Aristotle's laws of motion illustrates this. He said, upon observation, that things are at rest until set in motion. To satisfy his critics, and believing that rest was more noble than motion—for such was a natural presupposition in a slave economy—he brought in the notion of the Unmoved Mover of the Universe, the noblest, the god-like, even God, though nothing to worship. St Thomas canonized this idea of God in drawing upon Aristotle's thought to demonstrate, from the shape of creation, the necessary existence of God. And so the unmoving God of Greece became unwarrantably equated with the unswerving God of the Old Testament.

Newton, however, in effect reversed Aristotle, and remarked that things move till they are stopped, and that rest, so far from being uniquely noble, was only motion relatively at zero. However, since all motion was relative to the frame of space and time, there might still be one grand centre inhabited by the Unmoved

Mover. But Einstein's theories tacitly deny this. He takes up both Newton and Aristotle as special cases and turns the old-fashioned frame of space and time into new space-time, and makes this space-time into each beholder's private abstraction from reality. For each, there is a distinct space-time, his own self-selected path of consistency through experience. Time, space, instants, points, and motion, are all abstractions. None of the laws of relativity connecting them can give them any direct relation to an Unmoved Mover. In science, then, Aristotle's laws of motion have been put away. In religion, they are sufficiently safe from comment to remain, unnoticed and out of reach of correction, a fruitful source of false presupposition.

But this is not the whole danger. Because of other preconceptions of ours, these scientific laws are in their own fields a snare where they could be an object lesson. Whoever thinks that they deny room for miracle, for instance, forgets that they can be simply and quite suddenly abrogated by the laws of another plane of being. In our elementary chemistry we used to abrogate those of physics. Oxygen, mixed with a sixteenth of its weight of hydrogen would comfortably obey Boyle's law of partial pressures and Avogadro's hypothesis till we provoked a combination between them. And then we found water and wet steam; the same atoms of oxygen and hydrogen, but now obeying neither Boyle nor Avogadro but a higher law of chemical affinity. Similarly, biology watches the abrogation of some chemical laws, and psychology of some biological ones. Thus the laws of nature are not only provisional and descriptive, but they grade themselves.

Somewhat to one side, but silently governing our whole attitude to the world of law, stands the science of mathematics. Its kind of symbolic logic enters into every scientific investigation of space, time, motion, combination, and energy, for in each there appear the concepts of number and relation. But number and relation can be quite independent of any material source and manipulated without regard to one. The logical relation "such that" or the numerical notion "two" can survive in the abstract, whereas "heat" needs some host or other. Thus mathematics is the only science delivered from matter. It can knit away contentedly in a world of its own, deducing logical relations from logical relations. This it achieves by relying on a very few, very fundamental, principles, till the science takes on the character of a suit of chain-mail: Peano's twenty

principles are, as it were, the links at the hem round the neck. With these or one another all the rest of mathematics interlocks. As a result any mathematical question implies the whole suit and therefore its own solution. What is x if $x^2 = 1$? already implies that x = plus-or-minus 1. Moreover this character of mathematics extends beyond number to all logical relations such as, If A is such, does it equal B? The question contains its answer as much as the uninteresting, Do miracles happen? or, Is green a colour?

Mathematics cannot observe; but it can clearly reveal. For this reason and because the given world is too arbitrary and irrational for mathematics to handle till it has abstracted from it, we easily suppose that abstraction is a step in the direction of truth. But for faith it is a false step, for faith is not abstraction but interpretation, and needs the concrete world as much as the practical sciences, though for a different purpose.

So then, when men think and argue, as to-day they may, after the pattern of the scientific method, the background of their mind holds a conviction that "science" gives a dependable picture of experience and has a self-evident way of establishing the credibility of fact. If we explore that background, we find that it is natural for one to presuppose that "science" is truth, that its laws are obeyed, that its knowledge is extending from a firm and rational base, and that abstraction into concept and definition is the steady purification of knowledge. But we have found all these to be false presuppositions. Science is not truth, and does not discover it but uses some limited aspects of the notion of truth; its laws effect nothing, its knowledge is based on irrational brute fact and on beliefs about it which have been taken on trust. Once we look below the surface, we notice that it is just those things taken on trust and forgotten which form the true presuppositions of science. And these are the good things with which a trust in science endows a man. They will be the unrealized background to any discussion of the possibility of faith. They are, the belief that *something* exists; that though given and arbitrary and to that extent irrational, it is intelligible; that the given is at root one and harmonious, and yet no abstract system of concepts but a concrete universe. But these are nothing more nor less than matters of revelation: the result of centuries of Christian thought, even though sunk down into mere habits of mind, perhaps, and unnoticed. But we shall see that they are also the first steps towards the transfiguration of creation by meaning.

If we turn now from the world of law to the world of meaning, it is to find something of the same sort happening in religion: presuppositions have sunk out of sight. Christians speaking of faith, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, confuse those they speak with, and chiefly by what they do not say. A man may reply in many ways. He may say, I cannot believe since my child died; or, What has that to do with me? But whatever it is, it will hide a search for meaning. And yet it is a search baffled even in beginning by ignorance of the Christian's presuppositions. What these are the catechism already quoted could teach us. Who made you? God made me. Why did he make you? To love him and serve him in this world and to be happy with him for ever in the next.

To ponder those deliberately childish words is perhaps to stumble on the first forgotten presuppositions of religion: that man is by his creation endowed with and even compacted of—meaning; and yet only discovers it through his relation to God. And man's relation to God, we presuppose, is union; for though we may have forgotten it we recognize, as the only true relation of man to God, the life of the God-man. And that was union. If this appears to invert the usual order, it has been done to emphasize that our ordinary mind on the matter is ruled by a forgotten presupposition. But it will also distinguish as far as possible the religious from the scientific approach. We must come at man as if from Heaven.

The first advantage of doing so is to reveal at once a very general false presupposition, that men are human. No one of them is truly so. Since the Fall, we can only seek elsewhere for man, and we may, since the Incarnation, find him. We learn in fact that God alone can be called human. Not ourselves but God-in-flesh reveals the human being. Man is to return, and when he arrives at union with God, he will be human. That, humanly speaking, is what religion is for. So that the life of man-in-God, the life of Jesus Christ, is true religion. He is our source of meaning.

Our presuppositions develop themselves perhaps as follows. Our Lord's life was one of maintaining union with his Father through the Spirit; and at the same time, in a different manner, one of receiving into union through the same Spirit the human nature that he took. We in turn are united to him, through that Spirit and in the flesh, by our baptism, to share a common life. And so what we see to be true of his religion ought, according to the measure of the gift, to be true of ours. Our flesh, like his, is to be schooled into

union with the Divine; so that our whole life, now in his, can be set free into the life of union with his Father which he has always maintained. His two-fold life therefore defines what religion is: flesh being received into union by the divine, and this incarnate life then being brought into union with the Father. It is because we have presupposed but forgotten that religion proposes in a practical way this double union for men that our talk of faith in Jesus Christ is often such a dark saying to the outsider. We then try to bring in the light by attempting to make everything scientifically clear. We recall the proverb that Blake set in his strange book, *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*—that truth cannot be spoken so as to be understood, and not be believed—but forget that he put it among the proverbs of Hell. Religion contains its own meaning, as being a sort of principle of growth. Our Lord revealed it as something natural—arch-natural, in Charles Williams' phrase—to human nature, just as it was manhood at its arch-natural that was taken into God.

This is not to forget the necessary effect of our disunion and sin. But here again it has been a help to come at religion through Jesus Christ and his relation to God, rather than attempt the usual climb upwards from the obscure idea of man that we gain from what is already unnatural and inhuman through sin. If we had done this, we should almost inevitably have approached man's relation to God through man's own sense of estrangement and so assigned to religion a corner of life, to fortify and call Salvation. Whereas union with God means our enduring participation in those designs of his which span the whole universe from its creation to its final transfiguration. Flesh and blood shrink from any such idea, but our Lord came in flesh and blood to reveal the demand. The nature of the demand, its way with us, its hold on us, he proclaimed in his religion.

This religion of his, if we take it at its three levels, will show where the contrasts and the reconciliations lie, both between the worlds of law and of meaning, and also between the religion of God-made-man and that of fallen man.

We can notice at once that there is a continuous act of worship given and received even within himself. The flesh that he took into union responds to the divine by a humility that is self-effacement. His humanity waited upon his will however he might test it. But not in the sense that it stood outside or over against him. Man he was and stood as man at the disposal of his Spirit, so that his

speaking, looking, blessing, touching, tiring, and suffering—finally his dying and rising again—are effective expressions of his Spirit. Men fail in this effacement even when they know that their humanity, also, stands at the disposal of that Spirit. Yet, though our worship at this level is incomplete, it cannot differ from Christ's. Except that, fallen as we now are, it seems we are not granted this uniting self-effacement unless we find the willingness that lies in self-denial. And even self-denial learns its paces from him: when his flesh effaces itself we are not at first aware that it has done so: we take it for granted.

But then we may afterwards recall that his coming as man was his choosing to be served as creation's lord. So then this particular humility must reveal something of the true relation of this material world to its creator, and of man to both. We see he demands little and yet refuses nothing—and what he takes or is given he rejoices in. Behind the freedom and courtesy of this quiet exchange between the needs of his flesh and the concrete world we are watching Man assume his lordship. And yet what he does could be an epitome of the scientist's true preoccupation with the same world. At this level science and religion could be indistinguishable.

There are other times when for the sake of men he asks much of creation. Still he shows humility. Still, like a good scientist, he is concerned with the concrete world as it is given him. But this is the second level of his religion. It is the Incarnate Lord's correspondence with the Father's will as outwardly declared. The Gospels portray him as willingly, attentively obedient to facts. He seems to have observed them, accepted them, as from the Father, and entered into them, labouring to make them relevant to what he had to do. All kinds of facts he observed and used—things of the field, the ways of children, the tackle of trades, the ceremonies of wedding and feast, the ills and malice of man, the beliefs of his people, the authority of the Roman power. It was, My Father worketh hitherto and I work—with these things. Similarly, there are no mere miracles. None are significant simply because he overruled the laws of nature, but rather because by them he purposed to be understood. Not How, but Why, did they happen, is the intelligent question.

This human concern with unyielding fact is nothing but the seed-bed of the sciences. Each is rooted from its beginning in observation of fact. And to-day when attentive obedience to fact makes any

man a scientist, science becomes a necessary part of the liturgy of man. Through the sciences God is praised; and man becomes a priest of God not only through making creation more serviceable to God in man, but through penetrating and becoming identified with creation before God.

Yet it is just here where religion and science may seem to coincide again that they should be most sharply distinguished. As a man becomes attentive to anything, so he learns truths about it, scientific truths, and himself becomes a scientist. But the effort, in face of the facts, to be obedient to them makes him humble, perhaps reverent, but subject to them and an unconscious follower of Christ. Thus truth appears in two different modes. As a scientist he learns scientific truth, but in the struggle to discover it he reveals himself as a disciple bearing witness to the religious truth, and through his humility showing himself to be thus far "of the truth". This beginning is enough to allow us to notice that where scientific truth is a limited and dependent thing that we can possess, religious truth possesses us. That end for which our Lord came into the world—to bear witness of the truth—takes hold on men wherever they become attentive to fact. They share in Christ's religion, but especially through that close, persistent, and self-obliterating attentiveness which is science.

However, there are still proper frontier distinctions between religion and science, not to be obscured. Science builds up and advances itself through considering the specimen, the class. Though it begins with the concrete, its certainties are abstract. Religion can only be the activity of the personal, particular or corporate. First and last it is concerned with the concrete. To contrast it with its own science: where theology speaks of the salvation of mankind, religion busies itself with saving men. Again, science observes facts and deduces function, but has no view of purpose. Hence, though religion can here illuminate science, no science can illuminate religion except theology, because no other attempts to interpret one reality in terms of another. Theology alone is a science of transfiguration: it presupposes everything in creation to be interpretable and to need interpretation; whereas philosophy presupposes only that creation, though irrational in its givenness, is intelligible by man; its daughter sciences, merely that it is observable and consistent.

To understand this is to be delivered from the fallacy of thinking

that theology can be developed from a few fundamental notions and propositions, such as, that God is love. Theology, unlike mathematics, has to accept from religion and the revelation that it holds a great many complex and concrete facts to systematize and interpret. Peano could develop the whole theory of finite number from three basic notions and five basic propositions, but his logical abstractions are far from anything so concrete as a Child laid in a crib. Yet what controls the meaning of the three words, God is love, is that Child in his coming, life, deeds, and suffering. The words are not a hypothesis or a proposition as the unwary might suppose. They are an exposition, a saint's summary of God's self-giving.

We have so far considered our Lord's religion as the humility of the flesh in its union with the divine, and as the willing humility before hard fact. The highest level is his response to God's self-communication. It is the relationship to God in the spirit. And yet it springs forth as the act overcoming the apparent conflict between the worlds of law and of meaning: the backgrounds of faith are reconciled—by the act of faith.

Our Lord offered to the Father now the worship of his freedom, his self-determination. And if we ask what he was free to become who was born of woman, born under the law; or what he was left free to do, who was bound, scourged, crucified, and slain, we must answer that there was one freedom that none could take away, the Spirit's freedom to love. It was his religion to reveal it, to be the love of God incarnate. The shape of the world of law, of circumstance, seemed inexorable as it slew him, but by his faith in the Spirit he impressed upon it a transcendent meaning, he compelled it to be the bearer of his Father's love. His faith bound together the two worlds without destroying either.

Christ and his saints have revealed by their religion that there is a free Spirit in the world, aware of and attentive to the laws of the world, but free in them, and by its faith transfiguring them with meaning. We can only follow its effects and describe them by contradictions, saying that it gains by giving, wins by losing, lives and abounds by dying, and rejoices in weakness. In this, religion lies at its furthest from the presuppositions of the scientific mind. For the sciences, even those of psychology and psychiatry, assume man's free will to be under bondage to things lower than itself—memory impressions, gland secretions, hardened brain tissues—to which it reacts. But we have to speak of faith and of that which

is above the will and sets it free. We remind ourselves that unforeseeably, in prayer or miracle, through another's words or suffering, or immediately in the mind, we are called on to risk encounter with the same self-giving Spirit that was in Christ. But as it was his religion, so it must be ours, to give that Spirit free course. Sooner or later we must allow ourselves to be forgiven; to have our divided experience brought into a unity which we cannot foresee and would not understand; and to be set free by some cross or other on our lives, if we are ever to bear the responsibility of our manhood.

And yet, though belief in such a Spirit may become the reconciliation of two worlds, it starts by seeming to break the scientific mind on its own principles. A man when he risks this belief reaches the level of conversion, and finds that he must watch the security and decency of law being taken from him; and then must submit himself to become the material of an experiment over which he has no control. This surrender of all the secure detachment and the certainties by which he lives is a step into darkness that none can lighten for himself or another, unless by some analogy, perhaps, from science. Something might lead him to hope that as his self-conscious being already unifies its own varied levels into this self that now surrenders, so it might be the office of the Spirit to alter the laws and unify the ends of the surrendered creature and to raise it to some new manifestation of life. But then such a hope as this would be nothing less than the scientist's reaching out for that which is already promised within our religion—that double union in flesh and Spirit with God-made-man.

It may be that in this age we have been fortunate in receiving science and the scientific method for a sinew to our worship. By it we have the power to express more confidently what we learn from our Lord, the self-effacement of the flesh, the intelligent attention to brute fact, and the wise surrender to the Spirit. Our religion becomes a thing complete, our union with Christ, the fulness of a creature's worship, and our freedom.

THE LITURGICAL AND ECUMENICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED "WORLD CALENDAR" [1]

CHAD VARAH

THE attempt to measure and record the passage of time by objective standards is as old as humanity, for even the most primitive man cannot fail to notice the three God-given ingredients of his earthly routine: the day and the year, controlled by the rotation and revolution of the earth in relation to the sun; and the lunar month, occurring approximately 13 times in the year. The division of the year into quarters by solstices and equinoxes requires more than primitive observation, and the natural procession of the four seasons is confined to the temperate zones, but some kind of calendar is a necessity as soon as man forsakes his nomadic way of life and settles to agriculture.

With the progress of civilization it becomes important to keep some sort of chronicle of events, so that the numbering of the days of the month, whether lunar or artificially regarded as a twelfth of a year, makes an early appearance; and it is impossible to make or keep appointments unless the day and night are divided into hours and eventually into smaller subdivisions. The number 12 appears to have been chosen for the divisions of the year and of the day and the night, because of its divisibility by 2, 3, 4, and 6.

The fact that 13 is a prime number militates against the strict lunar month: why then do we find another prime number, 7, not only finding a place in the measurement of time, but surviving against all odds, and imposing its pattern on our calendars to-day? I need not expatiate on the mystical interpretations of the number 7: suffice it to say that these may have influenced nomadic peoples to divide the lunar month into four "weeks", and to name the 7 days of this arbitrary creation instead of trying to remember the

[1] Delivered in French to the Liturgical Conference at the Russian Theological College in Paris, and translated by the author.

names of 28 days of the month. This almost certainly happened amongst the Jews, whose observance of a weekly "Sabbath" made the week widely known thoughout the Roman Empire. Another powerful factor was the pagan "planetary week", apparently independent of the religious nomadic quarter-lunar week, allocating the seven days to the tutelage of the sun, the moon, and the five then known planets. The Jewish and pagan seven day week is retained in Christendom (in many countries with pagan names), and it is to its Jewish origins that we owe the *weekly* commemoration of our Lord's Resurrection, the Christian substitute for the holy Sabbath. The two languages most spoken in this conference are the best examples of both the Christian and the pagan week: Russian, in which Sunday is "Voskresenie" (Resurrection Day), and French, in which Sunday is "Dimanche" ("Dies Dominica"), but the working days, except Saturday, "day of the Sabbath", are called after the moon and the planets (Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, and Venus, in that order). The omission of Saturn does not mean that Saturnalia are never observed in France on a Saturday.

The primacy of the week, ignoring both months and years in its unvarying course of seven named days, is the chief point at issue, from an ecclesiastical point of view, in any discussion of the proposed World Calendar. Those who feel in conscience bound to oppose the omission of one day a year (two in Leap Year) from the weekly cycle altogether, will be bound to reject a scheme in which this provision is crucial, whatever benefits they may see in it otherwise.

Our era begins with the Julian calendar, introduced by Julius Ceasar in 45 B.C., readjusted by Pope Gregory in 1582, and untouched since. Its disadvantages present themselves most forcibly to the secular world, and particularly to the world of commerce, which finds its calculations complicated by the fact that months can be of seven different compositions according to the day of the week on which they begin (14 different in the case of February), and that the same month can have five Saturdays one year and four another. Indeed, but for the irregularity of the calendar the need to display it and consult it frequently would disappear: once the principle of a "fixed" calendar has been grasped, a moment's calculation will reveal on what day a particular date falls. But though the *pressure* for a revised calendar comes from the business community and the people who have to arrange school and university

terms, the Church also experiences some inconvenience in transferring feasts which fall on an important Sunday. It is generally understood that a fixed Easter, which would enable a more orderly arrangement of the Christian Year to be devised, would be incorporated into a regularized calendar, though this is not in fact essential to the "World Calendar" proposal, which only requires that the 365th day of the year can be dropped from the weekly sequence. Whether Easter is fixed or movable, confusion would obviously be caused if the Church disagreed with the world about which day of the week was Sunday, six years out of seven.

The history of the World Calendar goes back to the proposal of an Italian priest, Abbé Mastrofini, in 1834, to obtain a year of 364 days, dividing equally into 52 weeks, by removing one day (two in Leap Year) from the week-day sequence. Not until 1910 was this taken seriously, when the International Chamber of Commerce initiated a study of calendar reform which led to 185 proposals being put to the League of Nations in 1923. The "World Calendar" and a 13-month scheme were voted on by the 14 nations of the League in 1937, the former being chosen unanimously, but nothing more happened until 1949 when Panama tried unsuccessfully to have the subject placed on the agenda of the United Nations. A proposal by India, however, in 1953 was carried by 12 votes to 2, France being in favour and the United States and the United Kingdom in opposition (at that time). In July 1954 the Soviet Union added its weight in favour of the World Calendar, and the Roman Catholic Church expressed its readiness to co-operate with the United Nations in calendar reform. I am told that the Ecumenical Patriarch has written letters in favour of the "World Calendar". but informally and not in very definite terms. It is probable that those of the Orthodox who retain the Julian Calendar would be able to accept a completely new calendar more easily than they could accept the Gregorian.

The 18 nations on the U.N. Economic and Social Council voted unanimously for all Governments to study calendar reform and state their conclusions by May 1955, but if this happened it escaped my notice. It is likely that the proposed World Calendar will be seriously considered in the near future, and we shall be in a better position to safeguard the things the Church holds dear if we discuss it exhaustively from now on. This lecture pretends to be no more than an introduction to the subject.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

The World Calendar can be described in a few words. Its great merit is its simplicity. The year is divided into four equal quarters of three months each, the first month of each quarter having 31 days and the other two 30 days. The quarters invariably begin on a Sunday, because the day that follows 30 December is neither named as a day of the week nor numbered, but is an intercalary day described as "Worldsday" and is to be a holiday all over the world. In Leap Year another intercalary day similarly follows 30 June and is a world holiday called "Leapyear Day". If a League of Nations resolution of 1926 fixing Easter Day on the Sunday following the second Saturday in April is combined with the World Calendar scheme, as seems likely, Easter Day would always be on 15 April. The British Parliament authorized the fixing of Easter in this way in 1928 "when opportunity should arise", and the Church of England, both in the Convocations and in the Church Assembly, approved such a change if it were made with the consent of the principal Christian communions. No further legislation has been made about this, so far as I know, but the matter is sure to be revived in connection with the World Calendar even though it is a separate proposal.

It would take too long to enumerate the effects of a World Calendar and a fixed Easter upon all the Church Calendars of Christendom, and whilst the study would be fascinating in tabular form it would be most tedious to try to follow by ear. I shall therefore illustrate the effects by an examination of some features of the Church Calendar with which I am most familiar, namely that of the Book of Common Prayer with the additions and deviations proposed in 1928. It may cause the members of the conference some amusement in the evenings, when one may easily feel at a loose end in Paris, to examine what effect the World Calendar would have on the Calendar of their own Churches; though I should like to say at this point that the introduction of a World Calendar agreed by the world's *secular* authorities would be a tremendous challenge and a unique opportunity to the divided parts of Christ's Church to unite in establishing a single Calendar of the Christian Year so that all Christians were united in observance of the great Feasts and Fasts, and perhaps even in hearing the same Gospel read in their different languages throughout the world.

In the Church of England, if no alterations were made upon the introduction of the World Calendar and the Fixed Easter, Advent

Sunday would always be the first Sunday in December and would never clash with St Andrew's Day (30 November). The 4th Sunday in Advent would always be Christmas Eve, and the temptation to curtail the solemn preparation would be strengthened. Christmas Day would always fall on a Monday, and the three Red Letter Days which follow it would therefore not trespass on the Friday fast. Owing to the intervention of Worldsday, Christmas Day would always have one Sunday after it, before Epiphany, where at present there may be one or two; and this is a gain, except that the octave of Christmas would include the Circumcision, as New Year's Day would always be a Sunday.

My own proposal for dealing with this situation is bold in the extreme, but I pray it may commend itself, as I think the World Calendar presents us here with an amazing and glorious opportunity to exalt our Saviour in the eyes of the world and to end the divergence between East and West in the celebration of his Holy Nativity. You will have guessed already: I suggest that East and West should combine in celebrating Christmas on Worldsday, when everyone in the world would have a holiday in our Lord's honour, whether they knew the reason for the holiday or not.

To turn back to the Anglican calendar, the 4th Sunday in Advent would in this case be separated from Christmas by six days, and the first day of the new year would be the day of the first Martyr, St Stephen. The Feast of the Circumcision would now be on Saturday, 7 January. The traditional "twelve days of Christmas" would bring the Epiphany to Thursday, 12 January. Sunday, 8 January would count as the Octave of the Nativity. There would always be four Sundays after the Epiphany, which could well be renamed as the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th Sundays after Christmas. The last of these, by an alteration of only three days, could be observed as the Presentation of Christ in the Temple (otherwise the Purification of the B.V.M., otherwise Candlemas). There is something to be said for important events in the life of our Lord being celebrated on a Sunday, and Sunday, 8 January, would be a possible date for the Epiphany.

According to the World Calendar, Septuagesima Sunday would be 12 February, and Ash Wednesday would fall on a date occurring every year for the first time, 29 February. The first four Sundays of Lent would be 3, 10, 17, and 24 March, necessitating the transference of St Patrick's Day, Ireland's national day, from the 17th, and

making "Mothering Sunday" the Eve of the Annunciation, which would always fall on a Monday. Passion Sunday and Palm Sunday would fall on 1 and 8 April and Good Friday on the 13th. The Scottish Prayer Book alone commemorates Gilbert on 1 April and Justin Martyr on 13 April; the latter could be transferred to the day kept in the East, 1 June. The English Books have only three saints, also black letter, falling in what would always be Passiontide: Richard of Chichester, the latest saint in the 1662 calendar, on 3 April; Ambrose, on 4 April, already commemorated in the Roman Calendar on 7 December, the anniversary of his consecration, to avoid Lent and Easter week; and Leo the Great, on 11 April, who could be commemorated, as in the East, on 18 February. No great difficulty has been experienced so far, except for the difficulty of pursuading the mad Irish to change St Patrick's Day or keep it on the third Sunday in Lent: the only saint in the 1928 calendar whose day clashes with a Sunday in the period between Christmas and Easter is Vincent, the Spanish Martyr, on 22 January, and he could surely be put a day earlier or later.

Easter and the five Sundays after it cover the period from 15 April to 19 May, and only the last, Rogation Sunday, clashes with a saint's day. The date of commemoration of St Dunstan was fixed as early as 1029 by King Cnut, who seems likely to demonstrate once again that he cannot control the tide.

The Ascension Day would fall on 23 May, and the Sunday after would clash with St Augustine of Canterbury unless he were put forward two days to 28 May, as in the Roman Calendar. Whitsun would fall on 3 June, and Trinity Sunday on 12 June would clash only with St Margaret of Scotland in the Canadian calendar. The Scots, who should know, keep the day of her death, 16 November.

I will not trouble you with the Sundays after Trinity except to say that there would be 24 of them. The only important saints whose days fall on any of them are St John Baptist, St Swithun (the English St Médard), and St Mary Magdalene. St John Baptist cannot be transferred to the Eastern date, 7 January, as this has become the Circumcision; there is something to be said for arranging for him and other "red letter" saints to be commemorated deliberately on a Sunday after Trinity (or after Epiphany). As we have a popular belief in England that the weather on St Swithun's day governs that for 40 days afterwards, and also that it usually rains on Sundays, St Swithun must be moved back from 15 July to the

previous day—or better still, to the previous month, which is drier. As for St Mary Magdalene, it would seem appropriate that the first witness of our Lord's Resurrection should be commemorated on the first free day after Easter, Tuesday, 24 April. She would then come after St George, Patron of England, whose Eve would fall on Low Sunday. There is some advantage (if it can be regarded as liturgically permissible) in having a national day on a Monday, so that Sunday congregations celebrate it at Evensong the previous day without displacing the Sunday Gospel at the Eucharist.

This raises again the question of the major saints' days and other holy days. If we wish them to be widely observed, we must pay some attention to the day of the week on which they fall (and, under the World Calendar, fall invariably). There seem to be arguments in favour of three possible arrangements—but none in favour of sticking to the traditional dates irrespective of the consequences.

First: that these red letter days should be rearranged to fall on Sundays after Epiphany and Trinity, a total of 27 Sundays for twelve Apostles (four of them linked in pairs, so that only 10 Sundays would be used—or 9 if St John is still kept two days after Christmas); plus St Paul, St John Baptist, All Saints, and the Transfiguration. (I have already suggested that the Purification, a Feast of our Lady, should be celebrated on the Sunday before Septuagesima.) Would the balance of 14 ferial Sundays in the year be adequate? But for my preference for the third possibility I should, with certain reservations, favour this tremendous emphasis on the Communion of Saints, and would add the synoptic evangelists, St Mary Magdalene, St Barnabas, St Michael and All Angels, St Joseph, and the national Patron Saint, thus reducing to six the number of Sundays available for observances at the behest of the secular authorities. In England the number of free Sundays would only be five, since the Harvest Thanksgiving has come to stay, and may be regarded as a revival of the third great Jewish Festival, Tabernacles, which otherwise has left no mark on the Christian Church.

The second possibility with regard to red-letter days is to put them on a Monday so that at least the First Evensong is observed by our Sunday congregations. This has the merit of not interfering with a coherent series of passages for the Sunday Gospels and Lessons during the Sundays after Epiphany and Trinity. It also avoids the

necessity of preachers having to find something to say both morning and evening about Bartholomew.

The third possibility is to magnify the day of our Lord's Ascension, Thursday, into a mid-week holy-day, by making many Thursdays into red letter days. The other day near the middle of the week, Wednesday, is traditionally second only to Friday as a day for fasting, and a Thursday feast would give a Wednesday vigil. Surprisingly little change would be necessitated by this plan: Paul, Mark, Philip and James, James the Great, Luke, and All Saints would need to be a day later than now; Matthias, Peter, Transfiguration, Bartholomew, and Michaelmas a day earlier, Simon and Jude two days earlier, John Baptist and Mary Magdalene three days earlier, and the Annunciation and Barnabas three days later. The rest are already on a Thursday, except for the feasts linked with Christmas; and if Epiphany is celebrated 12 days after Worldsday, it too would fall on Thursday.

Since the time of Dionysius Exiguus, the civilized world has counted its years from the birth of the Founder of our holy religion, even though it has miscalculated by four, five, or even seven years. But though the years are Christian, the months and the days of the week are almost entirely pagan. Can we not at least make an attempt, however little likely to be successful, to have the months renamed? (Except for the possibility of changing "Sunday" to "Lordsday", there is little chance of renaming the days of the week.) It so happens that each of the months is marked by an event of great Christian importance—though, alas, the words tend to be too long to be popular. They are January, Manifestation; February, Presentation; March, Annunciation; April, Resurrection; May, Ascension; June, Inspiration; July, Visitation; August, Transfiguration; September, Exaltation (of the Holy Cross); October, Evangelization (by St Luke, author of the Acts); November, Commemoration (of All Saints); December, Incarnation. At least they all abbreviate nicely! If the world rejected them, we Christians could nevertheless use them amongst ourselves.

Whatever we decide to do about the World Calendar, I pray we may do it *together*, and use the opportunities it will present to achieve closer liturgical unity as a step towards the unity for which our Lord prays.

CHURCH SCHOOL FINANCE IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE

W. E. TATE

The Charity Schools

It is, or should be, common knowledge that the establishment of a national education system followed the foundation of the S.P.C.K. in 1699, and that this establishment was by, or under the influence of, the S.P.C.K. It is less well known that in the succeeding thirty years or so (in fact 1699-1732) under this influence there had been founded in England a network of some 1,500 schools, from Land's End to Berwick, from Dover to Carlisle, and this without a penny of assistance from the National Exchequer, and only by way of rare exception with any aid from such local government bodies as then existed. These schools owed nothing to the Central Government, virtually nothing to local Government. They were initiated, organized, financed and controlled by individual churchmen and churchwomen.[1]

These 1,500 schools, reported to the S.P.C.K. by their founders or others of their friends and supporters, and returned by the Society in its annual publications, are spoken of here as the Charity Schools, more especially and with most propriety so called. A century or so after their foundation many of them came into association with the National Society. If my estimate is correct rather less than half of them have survived to our own days as Voluntary Aided or Voluntary Controlled schools, usually entirely unaware of their long and interesting (and on the whole very creditable) histories. I have dealt elsewhere with their contributions to educational theory and practice, and with their place in the general pattern of English and educational development. Here I am concerned rather with this narrower question arising from their existence and their survival: Where did the money come from?

To this query there is no single answer. Each school was a law to itself, and raised its funds in such fashion as its promoters pleased. It will be seen hereinafter that a few of the methods adopted were

ingenious in the extreme. Perhaps some of them are rather to be noted for information and interest than held up as examples for present-day imitation.

Founders and Benefactors: Lay Dignitaries

Education in England has always owed much to the beneficence of private individuals, and in depending on private benevolence and local initiative the schools were following a sound English tradition. There are many instances in the Society's records of schools established and financed entirely by an individual patron. Often the benefactor was a local dignitary. Queen Anne herself smiled on the Movement, and subscribed handsomely to the schools at Kensington and at Windsor. To Newmarket she gave £50 p.a. Her successors largely maintained the school at Kew. There is much to be said for a royal example which made philanthropy fashionable.

Often, as noted below, the benefactor is not named in the Society's publications,[2] but the identity is veiled behind a general description as, "a Noble Lord" or "a Person of Quality". Sometimes it is possible to identify from other sources a benefactor who is referred to in the Society's publications only under the style of his status, or office, or condition. Thus often it is recorded that the school is maintained by the lord or lady of the manor. There are examples at Dowsby (Lincs.), Farmborough (Som.), Glentworth (Leics.), Horbling (Lincs.), Hunsingore (W.R. Yorks.), and Marshfield (Glos.). (Very exceptionally, as at Carlton (Lincs.), Dowsby (Lincs.), and Silsden (W.R. Yorks), such a school might be wholly or mainly for the children of the lord's tenants.) Or the lord of the manor might join in the good work with the minister of the parish. This happened at Dumbleton (Glos.), Greatford and Wilsthorpe (Lincs.), and West Kington (Wilts.). At Barkby (Leics.), and at Harmston (Lincs.), the benefactor was the patron of the benefice. At Kirkdeighton (W.R. Yorks.) and at Wingrave (Bucks.) the minister and his patron jointly maintained the school.

Founders and Benefactors: Clergy

Very often indeed the school is returned as founded or maintained in whole or in part by the minister of the parish. The archbishops and bishops set an excellent example here. At York the archbishop "encouraged the design and contributed largely to it". Two successive diocesans of Lincoln, Wake and Gibson, bestirred

themselves very much in the matter, and helped it forward both by precept and example. At Sarum the bishop, who maintained three schools at his sole expense, often visited them and presented the children with prayer-books and with money. Chester, Ely, Norwich, Oxford, Wells, and Worcester were all prominent in this. Various deans-and-chapters founded schools, or were especially generous in supporting them. Examples include Durham, Norwich, Oxford, Sarum, Wells, Windsor, and York. The Chancellor of the Diocese maintained the school at Fladbury (Worcs.). At Leicester the Commissary paid for the teaching of ten poor girls. At Spondon (Derbys.), the Prolocutor in Convocation augmented the master's salary. Many scores of instances could be given of schools "chiefly at the charge of the Rector",[3] "at the charge of the pious and worthy Minister", at that of "the worthy Rector and the well-disposed Persons of the Parish", etc. At Box (Wilts.), the minister gave the school his Easter offerings. The Rector (? and assistant curate) maintained the school at Hambledon (Bucks.). A former curate of the parish, when he became an incumbent elsewhere, set up the school at Swaffham Bulbeck (Cambs.). At Gateshead, Birtsmorton (Worcs.), Hastings (Sussex), and Spofforth (W.R. Yorks.) the incumbent endowed the school by his will. At Gatcombe (I.O.W.) a clergyman, born in the parish, endowed the school in the same way. Elsewhere the school often appears as established or maintained by the minister and his parishioners. There are instances at East Hendred (Berks.), Northill (Beds.), Peasmore (Berks.), Southill (Beds.), and Whitchurch (Berks.).

Other Benefactors

As well as these, a fair number of schools were founded or maintained by persons whom the returns do not specify. These, as noted above, are often described merely as "a gentleman", "a private person", "a charitable lady", "a private gentlewoman", "a citizen of London", "a merchant", "a clothier", "a tradesman in Westminster", "an Alderman of London", "a person unknown", and so on. Sometimes one finds, in pleasant eighteenth-century phrasing, "a Noble Lady", a "Person of Quality", "an Ancient Gentlewoman", or "a Pious Virgin". Some of the benefactors were very generous, and a few left the whole or virtually the whole of their estates to the school. At Wybunbury (Ches.), a benefactor left all he had to the school "and even his wearing apparel to be sold".

Especially in the early days of the movement, before it came to be involved in party politics and religious controversy, dissenters as well as churchmen supported it. Only in the greatest of the towns could they hope to provide schools of their own,[4] and the legal position of these would be very insecure. But before the bitter religious strife which disgraced the later years of Queen Anne's reign, free churchmen were quite happy to contribute towards Anglican schools. They are specially recorded as doing this at Croxton (Cambs.), at Hastings, and at Leeds. It was even said that on occasion the Dissenting contribution to an Anglican school was more generous than that of us Anglicans ourselves.

Often, as at York, the local gentlemen would provide a school for the boys, the ladies one for the girls. Similarly on a great estate His Grace would provide a boys' school, Her Grace that for the girls. Thus the Duke and Duchess of Bedford maintained the two schools at Woburn (Beds.). At Oxford the university looked after a boys' school, the city the girls' school. This arrangement should not be taken as suggesting that the University was more favourably disposed to the education of boys than to that of girls. It was made on the commonsense ground that "the City are mostly married men", while the Dons of course were not.

Corporate Bodies

Not only individuals subscribed to or maintained schools. So did bodies corporate of almost every kind. I deal below under "Rate Aid" with schools financed by local governing bodies, though it is often not clear whether these subscribed in their individual or corporate capacities, or as trustees of various benefactions. The two universities subscribed very handsomely indeed. Individual colleges helped—as for that matter they still do—with school provision, especially in the parishes where their estates lay. Thus at Childrey (Berks.) the school was supported "at the charge of a college in Oxford" (I suppose probably Corpus Christi). Merton College helped to support the school at Gamlingay (Cambs.).

Occasionally one finds schools recorded as maintained by London livery companies. I think it likely however that this was usually as trustees for individual benefactors, e.g. at Basingstoke (Hants.), where the school is returned as maintained by the Skinners' Company. Very exceptionally it is recorded that at Benwell (Northbd.), the proprietors of a colliery in 1712 set up a school for 70 poor

children of their pitmen. Quite uniquely I think, in 1706 at Winlaton (Co. Durham), some 400-500 employees of an ironworks allowed from their wages a farthing and a half in the shilling, and this with their masters' contribution maintained the poor of the parish and left £17 p.a. for the support of the school.

Subscriptions

Often the school is recorded as maintained by subscription, "by the contributions of well-affected parishioners", etc. There are instances, e.g., at Ashwell (Herts.), Cranfield (Beds.), Leeds, etc. In 1706 about 30 of the 100 provincial schools then recorded are known to have been maintained in this way. Often the subscription was made to a little local society whose function might be wholly or only partly that of maintaining the school. Epworth (Lincs.), had such a society in 1705, St Neots (Hunts.) one in 1711. A usual rate of subscription, as e.g. at Reading, was twopence per member per week. At Scarborouh in 1741[5] there was a five-shilling entrance fee, twopence a week subscription, with a penny extra for any member who came late to the weekly meeting, and twopence if he missed it altogether.

This was the method of school provision first contemplated by the Society, and very extensively adopted for the London schools. The Society's *Account of Charity Schools* gives a vivid description how "when 4 or 5 had agreed thereon their way was to express in a few lines the Necessity and Usefulness of the Design on a Roll of Parchment, with their Subscriptions, headed by the Minister's set forth. And the Design thus set on Foot they shew'd the Roll to the others . . . who subscribed also as they thought fit". Quite often the promoters were able to set up their school within seven or eight months after the design had been first mooted.

At Hull in 1729[6] subscriptions were received at the school, and the subscribers were not expected to pay up until they had heard the children say their catechism. Who usually collected the subscriptions in later years I do not know. As a schoolmaster I have a horrid fear that the rather invidious task was thrust upon the master of the school concerned. Certainly this was so at Shoreham (Kent) in 1709[7]: "One great Conveniency of these schools is this, that the Schoolmaster will always be very much under the Influence of the Curat of the Parish (and therefore instruct the Children in the Catechism, bring 'em to Church &c.) because the Assistance

of the Minister is necessary to him in procuring the Subscriptions". It was sometimes offered as an inducement to subscribers that they might nominate a child to the school for each subscription paid. Thus at Tiverton each subscriber of 30s. might nominate one child, at Newcastle-on-Tyne each subscriber might send one child. At Chelsfield (Kent) the children were sponsored by individual subscribers who paid their school fees.

Voluntary and semi-Voluntary Service as Schoolmaster

Even in Queen Anne's time, when schoolmasters were often paid almost as abominably as they have been in our own days, the master's salary was usually the major single item in the school budget. So it would aid the school very materially if one could economize on this. Sometimes the incumbent of the parish himself acted as unpaid schoolmaster. This happened, e.g., at Billingham (Lincs.), Binbrook (Lincs.), Broad Hinton (Wilts.), Clevepepper (i.e. Cliffe Pypard, Wilts.), and Horne (Surrey). At (? Westhide) a chapelry of Stoke Edith (Herefs.), the minister freely taught to write all poor children who would also come to be catechized. "And this several do, though some of them are above 20 Years of Age". At Burstow (Surrey), and at Mansell's Hope (Herefs.) the minister taught the children *gratis* in his own house.

In several parishes the assistant curate also acted as schoolmaster. At Wetherby (W.R. Yorks.), the incumbent of the mother parish doubled his curate's salary on condition he did this. The rector of Hamerton (Hunts.), allowed his curate an extra £6 p.a. for acting as schoolmaster. At Milton Ernest (Beds.), the impropriator restored to the vicarage the (rectorial) great tithes on condition the vicar kept a school for all the poor children of the parish. Sometimes, as e.g. at Melbourne (Derbys.), the schoolmistress was a clergyman's widow. In Lincoln no less than four schools were taught by relicts of deceased clergy. This was not so much a voluntary work on the part of these ladies as a means of finding them a suitable occupation which they might follow as a condition of receiving their modest pensions. The Melbourne schoolmistress was a great success. She received an almost nominal salary, but did her work so well that in 1710 she put forward no less than ten confirmation candidates, in 1714 15 candidates.

Sometimes the parish clerk,[8] at Honiton by way of exception the parish organist, acted also as parish schoolmaster. Usually, I think,

when this happened, as, e.g., at Bow Brickhill (Bucks.), and Dumbleton (Glos.), he was paid an additional salary for his services in addition to receiving his clerk's dues. Parish clerk schoolmasters are recorded at Burton Coggles (Lincs.), and at Kirkby Overblow and Spofforth (W.R. Yorks.).

It was of course rarely possible to achieve the modern educational administrator's ideal and find a schoolmaster who would teach for no salary at all. I think one of the women teachers at Atherstone (Warws.) was unpaid; it is not clear whether she taught generally, or whether her voluntary work was restricted to "Instructing in the Principles of Religion". "Two men" (unspecified) taught the children *gratis* at Kempston (Beds.), and "a private person" taught the school *gratis* at Stroud (Glos.). It was more usual to find the schoolmaster teaching one or two children for nothing in addition to educating his stipulated number of foundationers. Thus at Harthill (Yorks.), in 1725 the master, besides teaching his 30 foundation children, taught two more children gratis.[9] The master of (?which) Cripplegate School in 1704 offered to teach 40 children freely.[10]

Collections and Subscriptions

There were four or five other principal means available for financing the school, if an incumbent was interested in it and had the sympathy and goodwill of his parishioners. These merged into one another and were used to supplement one another, and it is not always clear exactly which was the method favoured in any parish at any particular time.

The Communion Alms

Two and a half centuries ago the collection of alms (except of course at the often infrequent communion services) was by no means as regular a part of divine worship as it is to-day. Collections upon "briefs"[11] for good causes outside the parish were regular enough, but often one of these was made only as a retiring collection. Very often indeed the sums so raised were derisory in amount.[12]

However, at any rate since the Reformation, the collection of alms for the poor has been an integral part of the Communion Service. The First Prayer Book of Edward VI ordains that "whyles the clearkes do syng the offertory, so many as are disposed, shall offer to the poore mennes boxes every one according to his habilitie

and charitable mynde". The present rubric is to much the same effect: "whilst these Sentences [of the offertory] are in reading, the Deacons, Churchwardens, or other fit person . . . shall receive the Alms for the Poor . . . in a decent bason . . .".

In accordance with the Ninth Rubric, after the service these alms are to be disposed of as the Minister and Churchwardens shall think fit. In the event of any disagreement the Ordinary[13] is to decide on the disposal of the Communion Alms. Alms gathered in church at any other time are legally disposable at the sole discretion of the Minister, This being so, often the whole or a major part of the Communion alms was appropriated by the Minister and Churchwardens to the maintenance of the school or the apprenticing of its scholars. At, e.g., Bristol, Temple Parish, Deverill (Wilts.), Eccleshall (Staffs.), Guildford (Surrey), Kennett (Cambs.), and Maidenhead (Berks.), apparently the whole offertory was applied to this pious purpose. Part of the offertory was so used at (*inter alia*) Wybunbury (Ches.). In 1706 some Oxfordshire parishes had monthly Communion Services, all the offertories at which were applied to the local charity schools.

Charity Sermons

In Queen Anne's time, and indeed much later, the sermon also was not regarded as an integral and indispensable part of Anglican worship, as in most parishes it tends to be to-day. The Canons to this day draw a clear distinction between beneficed clerks and allowed preachers. Clergy in the first class but not in the second are to confine themselves to reading the service as set forth in the Prayer Book, and reading the Homilies plainly and aptly, without glossing or adding.[14] Oddly enough, to our way of thinking, it was sometimes the laity who demanded more sermons, and longer ones, and the clergy who had to be cajoled into supplying them. The basic duties of a beneficed clerk were reading the services, administering the sacraments, and catechizing the children. Anything much more than these he might regard as a work of supererogation.

Many parishioners had an insatiable appetite for sermons, and the best of Anglican clergy were then as now models of sanctified common sense. So it was at once pious and businesslike to preach sermons occasionally upon special topics, and to accompany them by collections for appropriate worthy causes. The support of charity schools was such a topic, and many charity sermons were

devoted to it.[15] The most famous ones were the great national ones at St Sepulchre's, Holborn, but these were only the best known members of a very large class. In London and Westminster particularly, there was a most elaborate scheme of sermons (or "lectures", which to every one but the ecclesiastical historian amount to much the same thing). Thus, e.g. in 1711, 33 London parishes are returned as having for their schools regular charity sermons, besides "other Places . . . But the Times not fix'd". At St Alphage, London Wall, the sermon was at 5.0 on the second Sunday in the month, at All Hallows, Lombard Street, at 5.0 on the third Sunday, at St Botolph-without-Aldgate at 2.0 on the second Sunday after each Quarter-day, at St Anne's, Soho, at 10.0 and 2.0 on the Sunday before Christmas Day, and so on.

Similar sermons were preached in the cathedral cities, Exeter, Norwich, Oxford, and York, and in provincial towns, Hull, Ipswich, Nottingham, Sheffield, Stamford, and Wakefield. At Maidstone a collection was taken at a monthly lecture before the Communion. On occasion sermons are recorded also in small rural towns and villages, Nayland (Suffolk), and Spofforth and Wetherby (Yorks.). Oxford did this kind of thing particularly well.[16] There was an annual anniversary service in St Martin's, Carfax, on St Luke's Day, with catechizing, the account of St Luke's Festival from Nelson, a speech by the senior boy, a hymn, and an account of the schools. Then the children were examined by the Professor of Arabic, and the Chaplain of Christ Church preached a sermon. Two dons in their formalities stood at the door with plates for the collection. Finally the children and the trustees went together in procession along the High to the *Angel*, where they dined in company.

The School Box

Often there was placed in the church, not far from the ancient poor box, another collecting box specially appropriated to the maintenance of the school. Interesting examples of this are recorded at Hull, at Newbury (Berks.), and at Warwick, where an "Effigies the Charity School". Sometimes, as at Beverley, the box was fixed into the Church, with the inscription "For the Use and Increase of the Charity School". Sometimes as, at Beverley, the box was fixed in the school, and, I suppose, brought to the notice of patrons and visitors when they called there to supervise the master, to admire his work, or to catechize the children. At Spofforth (Yorks.), where

the rector was a great enthusiast for charity schools, he had (? another) box in the hall of the rectory. I take it he passed it round to visitors of rank and wealth after they had dined with him, when they might be expected to feel benevolently disposed towards the world in general and their host in particular.

Gifts in Kind

Doubtless there must have been many benefactors who preferred to make their contribution in kind rather than in cash. Their gifts, however, in the very nature of things, are hardly likely to have been often reported to the S.P.C.K., and in any case would not lend themselves to ready tabulation in the Society's accounts. Thus in a few parishes the freeholders agreed to an enclosure of common in order to form an endowment for the school. This happened, e.g., at Sheldon (Warws.),[17] and at Burton-in-Wirral (Ches.) (? in 1726).

At Owsden (Suff.), one of the subscribers allowed the school the use of a building rent free. At Badminton (Glos.), the school received an annual gift of cash and coals. At Blockley (Glos.), the vicar, who had built and endowed the school, partly from his own pocket, partly by begging from his friends, "gives the Master his dyet at Lodging". At Finedon (Northants.), where the children were boarded and lodged as well as taught, their bread came from arable land purchased specially for their benefit. The farmers of the parish ploughed this *gratis*. At York also the children were lodged and fed. The physician, surgeon, and apothecary all gave their services for the good of the cause, and in 1710 it was reported[18] that because of this care for the children's welfare not a boy of the school had died since its foundation in 1705. I do not know what was the child mortality in York in 1710, but the average must certainly have been considerably higher than the rate in the school.

The Recovery of Ancient Endowments

As well as encouraging the making of new charitable endowments, the S.P.C.K. did a good deal to secure the recovery of ancient ones which had lapsed or come to be misapplied. The Society was concerned in a bill put forward in 1712 to simplify the processes under the Act for the recovery of misused or withheld charitable endowments.[19] Although the Elizabethan charity legislation[20] was by no means perfect, it was possible to take action under it. A good example of a school established in consequence of a Charitable

Uses Commission is that at Attleborough (Norf.). The application to school purposes of ancient endowments of one kind or another, usually under the 1601 Charity Act, is recorded, e.g., at Bradford-on-Avon (Wilts.), Honiton (Devon), Irthlingborough (Northants.), Leyton (Essex), Stanton (Glos.), Titchfield (Hants.), Warwick, and Wilden (Beds.).

Sometimes the master or usher of the local grammar school was given an additional salary for teaching English to a stipulated number of poor children. (Quite often, no doubt, he was already teaching English to some of his other scholars, but this was almost invariably in return for fees. A free-school was free for Latin but not for English.) This means of supplying the needs of poor children was adopted, e.g., at Coleshill (Warws.), Leyton (Essex), Penrith (Cumb.), Solihull (Warws.), and Warrington (Lancs.). At Wybunbury (Ches.), ten charity scholars were so taught in the grammar school. The point is worth noting, for it appears that arrangements of this kind are responsible for a few mistakes in the Society's returns. Sometimes an ancient grammar school is misdescribed as a newly founded charity school, when in fact all that has happened has been that half a dozen or a dozen poor boys have been admitted to the grammar school, usually as English scholars, not as grammarians. This seems to have happened, e.g., at Kingsthorpe (Northants.), Stevenage (Herts.), Stickney (Lincs.), Throwley (Kent), Ware (Herts.), and Winnick (Lancs.).

A less admirable way of meeting the needs of the charity schools was the misapplication to them—permanently or for the time being —of ancient endowments belonging to grammar schools which had fallen on evil days. When the bill above-mentioned was under discussion, a member of the Society suggested that a clause should be included in it authorizing changes of this sort. The bill never passed, but there is no doubt that endowments were sometimes converted after this fashion, "an old decay'd *Latin School* turn'd into an English *Charity School*" etc. This is recorded, e.g., at Clyst-Hydon (Devon), Kettering (Northants.),[21] Soham (Cambs.), Whalley (Lancs.), and Wymondham (Leics.).

The charity school promoters, however, sometimes resisted the temptation to apply old endowments to general charitable purposes, instead of to the ends laid down by the original benefactors. Thus at Coleshill (Warws.) the receipts from the ancient Pater Noster Piece were still applied, as the original donor had stipulated, to

giving a penny to each of the children of the parish in turn, rich and poor, provided he came to church in the morning, at the sound of the bell, and on his knees before the usher of the Grammar School said the Lord's Prayer.[22]

School Fees

At Dedham (Essex) those parents who could afford it paid for their children's learning—the rest came free. At Horstead Keynes (Sussex) the schoolmaster must teach 20 poor boys freely, but had permission to take another 20 as pay-scholars. At Lewes there were 12 pay-scholars in addition to the 25 foundationers. At Thorpe (Surrey),[23] the master had 20 foundationers, and was allowed to take 10 more children as pay-scholars. At Wotton-under-Edge (Glos.),[24] he was "allow'd to teach so many other Schollars as may be consistent with his care of the Charity Children". At Spondon (Derbys.), the endowment was for 6 scholars but "the Master teacheth forty or fifty". The schoolmaster of Clerkenwell[25] had his Trustees' permission to take in addition to his foundationers ten pay-scholars at 20s. p.a. each, but when the "Agents for Schools" visited him they found he had 16. A Committee of the S.P.C.K. was appointed "upon this important Affair", but there seems no record of its report. There was a pleasant arrangement at Shoreham (Sussex), where the subscribers who had no children gave each 10s., 20s., or 40s. p.a., and those who had children, and could afford it, paid "more than Teaching their own Children would cost, . . . that the master . . . may afford to teach all the Children of the Poor *gratis*".

Children's Earnings

Usually the charity school curriculum, even for boys, was a somewhat restricted one, as is rather neatly set forth concerning the school at Northwich (Ches.). This confined itself to "educating them in Reading and Writing, and learning them Arithmetick". Often therefore with the girls, and less often with the boys, there was time for other less academic activities. In many schools, especially after the earliest days of the Movement, it was hoped that both boys and girls would contribute by their earnings toward the cost of their education, and sometimes to that of their maintenance. How far the trustees generally contrived to obtain much revenue from the boys' work I cannot say. From what I know of boys, I should

think the effort must often have been a vain one. Girls, however, were more amenable, the products of their traditional crafts were in constant demand, and they had more time available to pursue these. For the boys in general had heavier academic commitments. They usually learned not only to read and write, but also to cipher —the girls much more rarely acquired this last accomplishment. The boys might on occasion launch out into navigation, and sometimes even Latin.

Navigation is recorded, e.g., at Dover, Hastings, and Gateshead (Mathematics for the Sea). Latin is mentioned at Soham (Cambs.)[26] in 1718, and a charity schoolmaster from East Smithfield was recommended in 1717 for appointment in Jamaica "for his Piety and Knowledge of the Latin Tongue".

Exceptionally there were crafts pursued only by the boys—thus at Greycoat Hospital in Westminster in 1710 the children were employed *inter alia* in making and mending of shoes. I take it that this was an exclusively masculine occupation, carried out while the girls span, or knitted, or sewed. Spinning was much favoured. I find weaving only at Hull, where the children produced the yarn, and the spinning master wove it into cloth. Indeed, for many reasons weaving was essentially an adult occupation.

At Risley (Derbys.), the boys learned to read and write, the girls to sew and make lace. At Brighton the boys were taught reading, writing, casting accounts, and navigation, girls "to read and to work". At Yarmouth the girls spun and the boys made nets, at Box (Wilts.), both sexes learned knitting and spinning, and at Dumbleton (Glos.), Hull, and Rotherhithe both learned knitting. At St Neots (Hunts.), both learned to knit and to make bone lace. Sometimes fairly considerable sums were raised from this source. At Finedon (Northants.), the children spun jersey, and the cloth made from it was sold to several charity schools in London. At Peterborough and at York most of the cost of the school was met from the children's spinning.

At Launceston, Salisbury, and Stamford the girls were to "have what they earn for their encouragement". At St Peter-le-Bailey (Oxford.), they kept the cloth they made. At Blewbury (Berks.), and Melbourne (Derbys.), they made their own clothes, but apparently none for sale. At Oxford St Martin's, they made stockings for themselves and for the boys. At Eccleshall (Staffs.), they clothed themselves, and "if any was left over" it was given to the boys. At

Doncaster in 1722 "some of the Children were cloath'd by their own Labour".[27] I think all girls invariably, (and very properly), learned sewing . Some indication of the other crafts pursued is given by a note under Stamford, where the girls were supplied with "wheels, reels, fire and candles". Knitting is recorded at Alton (Hants.), Bray (Berks.), Colchester, Exeter, Hereford, Market Lavington (Wilts.), Romford (Essex), and Selbourne (Hants.), spinning at Blewbury (Berks.), Doncaster, Hull, Kettering, St Peter-le-Bailey Oxford), and Newcastle-on-Tyne, knitting and spinning at Atherstone (Warws.), Chipping Campden (Glos.), Coleshill (Warws.), Eccleshall (Staffs.), Oakham, Preston, Sheffield, Stanwell (Middx.), and Wakefield, knitting, carding, and spinning at Hartlebury (Worcs.), knitting and making bone lace at Launceston. In some seafaring towns, as, e.g., at Beverley in 1710, following a precedent established at Wapping, oakum picking was recommended as an agreeable, invigorating, and profitable occupation for the young (? boys and girls). I do not know how far the advice was followed —very little, I trust. On the other hand I am happy to say that when in 1735 the Society circularized many schools on how far it was possible to add work to learning without neglect of the latter, and what receipts might fairly be hoped for, Leeds replied in 1736 that the subscribers were much "against any constant work for the children," because it "Crippled the Chilns. tender limbs (and made ym unfit for Service)".[28]

Miscellaneous Receipts

In addition to the more formal methods referred to above, individual parishes or promoters adopted money-raising schemes so varied as to defy any sort of classification. The London parishes in particular displayed marked ingenuity in this. St Paul's, Shadwell, farmed its street lamps. In St Katherine's by the Tower the trustees acted as Land Tax collectors, and gave the school their poundage. Sometimes the magistrates handed over to the school a share of the fines levied in court, particularly those in respect of offences involving profanity and debauchery.[29] The courts spiritual seem to be recorded less often than the temporal ones as helping the school in this way. There is, however, an instance at Holme (Hunts.),[30] where "6*li* appointed by the Spiritual Court to be paid by one there as Comutation Money for Penance enjoyned him for Adultery has with the Consent of the Bp. of Lincoln been laid out in purchasing

a Turf lot to the Value of 10s. p. ann. for the perpetual use of the Charity School there".

The Minister of Water Orton (Warws.), had in his parish an endowment for a monthly sermon. He and eleven of his clerical brethren agreed each to preach a sermon a year *gratis*, so that the endowment might be used for the school. Another incumbent at Ewhurst (Surrey) gave to his parish two palls for use at the funerals of parishioners. These were hired out, the better one at half a crown a time, the other at a shilling, and the fees charged for their use were given to the school funds. Authors who wrote books for the Society often did the work for nothing. In 1707 it was proposed that any author who was a member of the Society should give it a share of the profits upon any book he wrote.[31] I do not know whether or not this proposal was accepted. Perhaps the most picturesque origin[32] of any school endowment is that of Ashby de la Zouch (Leics.). Here a clerk in holy orders successfully apprehended and prosecuted to conviction a highwayman. He was therefore entitled to a reward of £40 plus the felon's horse and arms.[33] Apparently he felt some compunction about receiving the price of blood,[34] and he applied the money, £50 in all, to the foundation of a school.[35]

The Society had no objection to the school receiving money acquired through gambling or games of chance. Thus a pious young lady of Newland (Glos.) began for the local school a poor box, in which she put part of her winnings at cards. In 1707 the school's receipts from this were £1 16s. 6d. The school at St Martin's in the Fields drew £40 p.a. from lottery tickets. Elizabeth Gee at Beverly bequeathed to the school there tickets 57121-57141 in the Million and a half Lottery of 1710. The tickets were lucky, and the school drew from the Exchequer £14 p.a. for 28 years.[36] As late as 1790 Samuel Whitbread I, in his capacity as banker, for a cash payment of £300 granted Ozell Pitt a life annuity of £50. Whitbread voluntarily undertook that if, because of Pitt's early decease, he had made any profit on the transaction, other than fair interest for money advanced, such profit should be paid in Pitt's name to the charity schools of St Luke's, Old Street.[37]

Aid from public bodies

The methods of financing education which occur first to the modern mind were rarely or never adopted or even contemplated in Queen Anne's time. The Queen herself and many members of her

Governments subscribed handsomely to the Movement, but they did this as individuals. Government help was never given, and the nearest approach even to a proposal that it should be was, I think, a scheme of 1718 that the London schools should be federated under a consolidated governing body,[38] and that in addition to all existing subscriptions and benefactions this should receive the proceeds of a tax of twopence a chaldron upon all coals brought into the Port of London.[39] There was also a proposal for rate under Private Act in two Welsh counties alone in 1712.[40] It was however apparently only a random suggestion, and I know no more of it. A very reprehensible proposal was made in ?1725-7 by Mr Gifford of Bishop's Castle (Salop);[41] it was not accepted, but is worth recording as a (? unique) example of charity school promoters' trying to finance the school at someone else's expense instead of their own. The suggestion was that "a Tax should be levied upon Servants' Wages for the Support of Charity Schools".

Local benches of magistrates, corporations, and even rural vestries on occasion made handsome grants of one kind or another to the schools. In general, however, these were for capital expenditure rather than maintenance, and often they were from charity funds of which the bodies were trustees, rather than from assessments, rates, levies, lewnes, etc. At Beverley the Justices gave for a school part of their public hall, and the Corporation part of theirs, contiguous to the other. At Doncaster the Corporation clothed part of the children, and subscribed handsomely to a fund for buying wool wheels. Leeds Corporation gave the school an old workhouse, with supplies for repairing it and fitting it up. Newcastle Corporation allowed the schoolmaster £16 and a house rent-free. At Stamford the Corporation granted the school £20 p.a. At Warwick the Corporation granted £10 p.a. "out of an old Charity". At York the Corporation found the building, and every individual member of it, Lord Mayor, Aldermen, Sheriffs, and Common Councillors, contributed liberally from his private purse to the annual cost of maintaining it. By way of exception Newbury Corporation financed the school without any external subscription. Similarly, at Burgh (Lincs.) the parish granted the school £10 "from land left to superstitious uses", Sheldon (Warws.) granted £4 p.a. from the parish land, Yardley (Worcs.), £5 "out of its publick rents", Melton Mowbray (Leics.) helped to maintain the school by paying an annual £13 6s. 8d. "by consent out of the Town Lands".

Rate Aid

Raid aid seems to be mentioned either specifically or by implication in Aldgate, where the Vestry "ordered 20 more boys into Mr. Symms's School allowing him £20 p.a.",[42] and at Stanwell (Middx.), where the parish clothed the children when they were first placed in the school. It is quite clearly recorded at Croft (Lincs.), where the school was "partly at the charge of the Overseers", at Keelby (Lincs.), at Holme (Hunts.), where the excess of the school cost over a £6 endowment was paid by the parish of Glatton, and at King's Norton (Worcs.),[43] where the school was "maintain'd out of the Poor's Rate". Other instances occur at Marston (Beds.),[44] where the Overseers allowed 50s. p.a. for the teaching of six poor children, at Milbrook (Beds.), where several poor children were "taught at the charge of the Parish upon the Poor's Rate," and at Oxford St Martin's, where the parish granted the school an annual subsidy of "half a poor's rate". There was an interesting instance of an attempt to supply rate aid at Wyberton (Lincs.). Here "Mr Shaw the Minister had in a manner effected the setting up of a Charity School in his Parish by an Assessment; but that not being countenanc'd by any Act of Parliament it was oppos'd". E. Kellsall of Boston advised him to proceed the ordinary way by subscription, and offered him £20 to begin the good work. The school survived this initial difficulty and remained at any rate until the end of the Charity School period.

I hope I have illustrated my point. It seems to me quite clear that the educational aims of the philanthropists of two and a half centuries ago reflect the greatest credit upon their common sense, their charity, and their humanity. I think also that their financial methods, plans, and expedients are equally creditable to their resourcefulness and ingenuity. So much then for the fashion in which the money was raised. I wish very much it were possible to go into similar detail concerning the way in which it was spent. That however would, in the nature of things, be a more difficult topic to investigate, and if the inquiry is made at all its reporting must be the work of a future article.

[1] Sometimes indeed the provision of the school was combined with that of an (Anglican) chapel-of-ease. There are instances at Ashton (Northants), Cranbourne (Berks.), and Silsden (W.R. Yorks.). Quite often the school was held in the parish church or chapel, e.g. at Tunbridge Wells, Kent.

2 This appears to have been in pursuance of a definite policy of the Society and its members. On occasion the Society found it necessary to apologize, not for naming the "bountiful and humble Benefactor", but even for referring to his existence.

3 e.g. Green's Norton (Northants.), Hadzor (Worcs.), Heydon (Essex), "Hinton Parva" (i.e. Hinton Waldrist, Berks.), Holton-cum-Beckering (Lincs.), Huntley (Glos.).

4 If I ignore the history of the Dissenting charity schools here it is not because I minimize their importance or interest, but merely that they are not my present concern. Their history is very obscure and is badly in need of investigation. Certainly there were a few—Gravel Lane, Southwark (1685) was probably the first, those at Shakespeare Walk, Ratcliffe Highway (originally in St Paul's, Shadwell) and at Horsleydown, Southwark, the next. Others were established, especially after the repeal of the Schism Act in 1718. Dr Jones *The Charity School Movement*, p. 132, refers to others at Bristol, Calne (Wilts.), Daventry (Northants.), Downend (Glos.), Mangotsfield (Glos.), Northampton, Pulton (? Poulton or Poulton-le-Fylde, both Lancs.), Ribchester (Lancs.) and St Albans. Her appendix 1 (iii), p. 355, gives other endowed schools, some 38 in all, which survived until 1842, and which were attached to the Dissenting interest. Since Nonconformist schools were normally "subscription schools" these 38 must be but a small proportion of those existing. The whole question cries out for an investigation—preferably of course by a Free Churchman.

5 S.P.C.K. Abstract Letter Book (hereinafter cited as A.L.B.) 25.18 27 Nov. 1741.

6 A.L.B. 15.10261 22 July 1729.

7 S.P.C.K. General Minutes (hereinafter cited as G.M.) 2-4.9 2 Jan. 1707.

8 A.L.B. 13.8630 21 Dec. 1725.

9 On the Parish Clerk as parish schoolmaster the only article I know is my own in the *Journal of Education*, Aug. 1953.

10 Dr Jones, p. 57.

11 On "briefs" see my *Parish Chest*, Cambridge 1946, and edns., Bk. 1 Chap. 3, and references there given.

12 Except of course for such popular causes as the ransom of Christian captives from the Algerine pirates, or the succour of Protestant refugees from Popish persecution.

13 I have come across a Welsh instance of the Bishop, presumably on the appeal of the churchwardens, disallowing the use of the Communion Alms towards the upkeep of the school, but I know of no English example of this.

14 Canons 46, 47, 49, 50, 52.

15 I think the only introduction to the study of Charity Sermons is my own in the current *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*.

16 Oxford has never admitted any necessary antithesis between piety and gulosity. One of the (City) subscribers to St Martin's School each Sunday took a boy home with him to dinner. I have found little of such dining of charity boys elsewhere except at York, where once a year the entire school dined in state with the Lord Mayor and the Sheriffs.

17 A.L.B. 6.4495 27 Oct. 1715.

18 A.L.B. 2.1978 1 Feb. 1710.

19 A.L.B. 3.3057 17 Apr. 1712.

[20] 43 Eliz. c.4. (1601). The Inquisitions and Decrees under this are I think the most neglected of all major sources for the history of schools and education in England. There is a (not very adequate) guide to and index of them in P.R.O. Lists and Indexes no. X, 1899.

[21] A.L.B. 8.5272 11 July 1717.

[22] The S.P.C.K. considered, as I do, that this was an ancient and godly usage which should be maintained and this both as a matter of piety and common honesty. It needed Victorian reformers to discover that it was a waste of money and that the endowment would be more usefully applied to general educational work. As part of the consolidated funds of the Coleshill Grammar School it survives to this day.

[23] G.M. 14.106 30 Nov. 1731.

[24] G.M. 9.149 2 Feb. 1721.

[25] G.M. 1.201 2 Apr. 1702.

[26] A.L.B. 11.5616 2 June 1718.

[27] A.L.B. 11.7012 29 Mar. 1722.

[28] A.L.B. 19.13689 6 July 1736. I am happy to say that Leeds was a tender-hearted town. In 1719 it had dismissed the schoolmaster because he had been so "extravagantly passionate to a poor Boy".

[29] Dr Jones, p. 57. I suppose the fines were levied under such statutes as 4 Jac. 1. c. 5 (1607), and 21 Jac. 1. c. 7 (1624) which authorized a fine of five shillings per offence of drunkenness, the money being payable to the church-wardens, for the benefit of the poor of the parish. 21 Jac. 1 c. 20 (1624), as extended by 6 & 7 W. & M. c. 11 (1694) has a sliding scale of fines for profane cursing and swearing.

[30] A.L.B. 8.5596 25 May 1715.

[31] G.M. 2-4. 52 30 Oct. 1707.

[32] I except of course the famous Betton Charity of 1723, for redeeming Christian captives from the Sultan of Turkey and the Dey of Algiers, which is used to this day for subsidizing church schools.

[33] I suppose under 4 W. & M. c. 8 (1692).

[34] Cf. Matt. 27. 5.

[35] A.L.B. 9.5876 1 Jan. 1719.

[36] A.L.B. 6.4354 28 Apr. 1715.

[37] Private Ledger of Samuel Whitbread I 26 May 1790, *ex inf.* Mr Peter Mathias.

[38] It had been proposed in 1704 that the benefactors to the schools should be incorporated, and proposals to this effect were suggested for addition to the Poor Bill of 1704. This is Sir Humphrey Mackworth's Bill which provoked Defoe into writing *Giving Alms no Charity*. The Bill failed and so, of course did the proposal. G.M. 1.289 20 Apr. 1704.

[39] A chaldron is 36 bushels. I suppose the analogy was with the rebuilding of St Paul's, which was carried out largely from the produce of a levy of 1s. 6d. a chaldron on all sea-coal brought into London.

[40] A.L.B. 3.2980 21 Feb. 1712.

[41] A.L.B. 15.10545 6 Dec. 1729.

[42] G.M. 1.129 20 Jan. 1701.

[43] G.M. 13.73 27 May 1729.

[44] G.M. 1.103 28 Sept. 1704.

A NOTE ON "THE EPISCOPAL LICENSING OF SCHOOLMASTERS IN ENGLAND"

GLADYS JENKINS

MR TATE'S survey of the licensing of schoolmasters which appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review*[1] must have stimulated a good deal of curiosity about English schools. It encouraged me to look at the problems of licensing over a very short period at the end of the sixteenth century for the diocese of London.

For the Elizabethan period the important act in the episcopal control over teaching is the Supremacy Act of 1563 (5 Eliz. c. 1). This asserted that no one was to uphold the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome in England, and added various groups of people to those who already had to take the oath of supremacy. Among the additions were those taking Holy Orders, graduates, lawyers and law officers, and "all Scholemasters and publick and private Teacheres of Children". The oath of supremacy demanded recognition

> that the Quenes Highnes is thonelye supreme Governour of this Realme . . . aswell in all Spirituall or Ecclesiasticall Thinges or Causes as Temporall, and that no forreine Prince Person Prelate State or Potentate hathe or oughte to have any Jurisdiccion Power Superioritee Preheminence or Aucthoritee Ecclesiasticall or Spirituall within this Realme . . .[2]

The obvious way of ensuring that such an oath was taken by those who intended to teach was to make the issuing of a licence dependent on the taking of the oath. While the licence itself was, as Mr Tate suggests, a man's personal property, the fact that he had been licensed was the concern of the authorities of each diocese and enrolment therefore was not always as infrequent as Mr Tate seems to have found. Moreover, there is evidence that the authorities took licensing seriously when we find in the Consistory Court Correction Books the presentation of offenders who did keep school and teach scholars without a licence.

Nor was the fee for the issue of a teaching licence a trifling amount. In 1583 Philip Stubbes had regarded the high cost of a licence as one of the "abuses" in England.[3] He approved of the system of licensing, for it kept out on the one hand the ignorant and on the other "papists and other schismatikes, aposta[t]es, or else whatsoeuer", but that the schoolmaster should be expected to pay "x. xvi. or xx. shillings" for a licence he thought preposterous. And so it was when, at the very time Stubbes was writing, a house, garden, and ten pounds a year was a suitable provision for a country schoolmaster.[4] Even if Stubbes was exaggerating, it is legitimate to infer that licence fees were a heavy imposition.

It is, however, in no spirit of captiousness that I wish to add my note to Mr Tate's findings, but rather to comment on some interesting points in the history of ecclesiastical control of education.

Here, then, are some results of a rough sampling of the period 1585-1605 in the diocese of London.

While, as has already been said, no licences appear in the Bishop's Registers for this period, there still remains the rich field of the Vicar-General's Books which enrol, among other things, licences for marriages, many licenses to preach, and licences to teach.

Perhaps the first comment that may be made about the licences to teach is that all—for this period—are issued to men. That women were teaching is known, and one would have thought that they would come within the definition of the act as "private Teacheres of Children", and that the authorities would have wished to make it as impossible for recusant women to influence their pupils as for recusant men. However, women's activities seem to have been ignored.

The second point which the licences make clear is that the distinction observed by Strype[5] between teaching "grammar" and teaching other things was a real one. It certainly existed in the mind of the enroller of the licence given to one Henry Boulton in February 1594. He first wrote that Boulton was to be licensed to teach "grammar", crossed that through and substituted "reading and writing".[6] Licences for teaching grammar were generally granted to graduates, but the qualifications of the men who taught reading and writing and perhaps the rudiments of Latin are not clearly distinguishable, except that from about 1591 or so the entry clerk tended to describe the non-graduate applicant as "literatus".

It may be useful at this point to consider the licences granted

during one year. I took as a random sample the year beginning 4 September 1601, the date of the first licence in the volume for 1601-5 of the Vicar-General's Books[7] and found enough licences being granted to lend some colour to Stubbes's statement that there were schools of sorts "almost in euery parish".[8]

Between 4 September 1601 and 4 September 1602 then, there were forty-two licences granted in the diocese of London. Of these, twenty-two were for the teaching of grammar. Eleven of these applicants held the degree of M.A., nine of B.A., one is described as a student of Trinity College, Cambridge, and about another nothing is stated.

The remaining twenty licences can perhaps best be summarized thus:

No.	*Licensed for the teaching of*	*Qualifications*
8	Reading and writing	1 priest 3 *literati* 4 undescribed
2	Reading, writing, and rudiments of Latin	undescribed
2	Rudiments of Latin	1 B.A. 1 undescribed
1	English and rudiments of grammar	undescribed
3	English	,,
1	English and writing	*literatus*
1	French	Englishman, born in the City
1	English and Dutch	Dutchman
1	French and German	Foreigner

In other years, too, the marked tendency to license only graduates for the teaching of grammar remained constant. In earlier years there is a variation in the terms of the licence for those teaching the more elementary subjects or younger children. In 1589, for instance, the clerk fairly regularly uses the term "docendi Pettittes" for what is apparently junior teaching, and it is noticeable that none of the teachers of "Pettittes" is said to be a graduate.

During these twenty years from 1585-1605 I find that, apart from the teaching of grammar, most of the licences are for the teaching of reading and writing, though occasionally individuals are licensed for one or the other. Sometimes the English language is taught, which may or may not have been the same thing. Arithmetic appears very rarely, and there was apparently a distinction between teaching "*computandum*" and teaching "*artem arithmetice*".

One of the most interesting aspects of teaching, which in the diocese of London is confined to the City and its environs, is that foreign languages make their appearance as subjects for instruction. Licences were granted to Frenchmen who hoped to teach French—they sometimes added Latin or arithmetic or writing and once music—occasionally a Dutchman would teach his own tongue, or a "Belgicus" would offer French, Italian, and German. Clearly there was a demand for foreign languages, but among whom? Is there a similar demand in other ports, or is it only in London?

To what kind of schools did these schoolmasters go? Sometimes it seems clear that the village parson conducted a school—he might be granted his licence to teach, if he wanted it, when he was inducted into his living. Occasionally there is a suggestion of a flourishing country school or perhaps one should say an enthusiastic demand for education, as at White Roothing, in Essex. A schoolmaster was licensed for the teaching of reading and writing there in February 1602 and three months later the new parson secured a licence to teach grammar. But precise information about the schools to which masters went, whether public or private, the Vicar-General's Books do not record.

1 Vol. 157, No. 325 (Oct.—Dec. 1956), pp. 426 ff.

2 1. Eliz. c. 1.

3 *The Second part of the Anatomie of Abuses*, 1583, sig. D4. Mr Tate's statement that the fee for a licence "was but a shilling", clearly does not hold for the end of the sixteenth century.

4 Harold Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes* (1952), p. 3.

5 Strype's *Whitgift*, cited in the *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. 157, No. 325, p. 430.

6 L.C.C., Vicar-General's Book (Stanhope II, fol. 162v).

7 Ibid. (Stanhope V).

8 Stubbes, op. cit., sig. D3v.

THE MISSIONARY AIM

P. A. MICKLEM

IN SUCCESSIVE numbers of this Review, recently published,[1] there appeared in two parts an article under the title "Principles of Missionary Strategy", in which the writer directed attention to a number of considerations to which, under present-day conditions, due weight must be given in the planning and strategy of the missionary campaign. The present article is contributed not as a criticism of, but as a supplement to, what was said in the earlier.

It is written in order to call attention to the vital importance of keeping clearly in view the end and aim to which the missionary campaign is, or should be, directed. The strategy, and for that matter the tactics, by which a campaign is conducted, are of value only as they contribute to its grand goal. If, as the writer of the earlier article so well pointed out, the times are calling for a fresh assessment of missionary method, that necessity arises not least from the larger aim which it is increasingly coming to be seen must be its dominating factor.

It seems fitting, then, to attempt to give clear expression to that larger aim, and to adumbrate the immensely difficult task involved in its fulfilment. It is not, perhaps, untrue to say that the common assumption underlying the whole missionary enterprise has been, and still is, that it is directed to the conversion of the men and women in the non-Christian world to personal allegiance to Christ, and their incorporation into the life and fellowship of the Christian Church. The extent to which the enterprise as so conceived has been richly blessed is testified to by the number, vigour, and quality of life of the younger Churches. There they are, islands larger or smaller in the great sea of paganism from which they have emerged, and by which they are still surrounded. These younger Churches are rightly set, on the one hand, on guarding and cherishing the treasure of their Christian life, faith, and worship, and on the other on evangelizing the world around them with a view to bringing

yet more and more into the fold of the Church. In other words, it is the building up and enlargement of the Church in its organized, institutional form, the "lengthening of its cords and the strengthening of its stakes",[2] which is normally conceived as the aim to which the planning of missionary strategy should be directed. Nor is there any need to emphasize the vital importance of the missionary enterprise as conceived in these terms. For without such strong focal points of Christian life and fellowship, not only will individual converts be left spiritually homeless but no effective impact will be made on the non-Christian world from which they have come.

And yet, is this in itself enough? Does this in itself comprise the full range of the missionary aim? Must not that aim be envisaged in larger terms, and include, beyond the incorporation of an ever greater number of converts into the life and fellowship of the Church, the reaching out to, and transforming, at every level and in every sphere, of the life of the people from which the membership of the Church is drawn? It is not only men in their individual capacity, it is the whole man and the whole life of man which is the subject of the Gospel's redeeming and transforming power. The younger Churches, established in lands prevailingly non-Christian, cannot, or should not, rest satisfied with their own closely-knit corporate life, while beyond their sharply drawn frontiers whole ranges and spheres of life are left untouched, and unleavened, by that spirit of Christ which is the source and shaping power of their own life. The "manifesting of the savour of the knowledge of Christ *in every place*",[3] in all those areas of life, from the family outwards, in which men are associated together for common ends—this must be included in the wider missionary aim.

Indeed, is not this larger aim implied in the final command which the risen Lord gave to the apostolic company which was to carry on his work, as attributed to him by St Matthew?[4] In the Revised Version that command stands as: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations," a command which presumably is commonly understood as meaning: "Make disciples *out of* all nations", bring those drawn from every nation and people and tongue to the confession of Christ's Name and into the fellowship of Christ's Church. But the implication of the original Greek is wider than this. Indeed, the Authorized Version is nearer the meaning in its translation: "Go ye therefore, and *teach* all nations". More

literally translated, however, the command stands: "Go ye, therefore, and *disciple* all the nations", i.e. bring the nations of the Gentile world, and the whole life of the nations, into the school, and under the discipline of Christ, in such a way and to such an extent that not only no people, but no area of a people's life, is left outside that realm in which the Gospel, as the power of God to salvation, fulfils its saving work. Not those of every nation only, but every side of their common life, and all their corporate interests and activities which constitute their common life, are to yield to, and manifest the effect of, the transforming power of the spirit of Christ.

Such then, in general terms, is that larger aim which must not be lost sight of by those who are guiding the destinies of the younger Churches, and of those responsible for missionary strategy. That vast area of human life, the national, social, and economic structure within which it is lived, which stretches beyond the closed frontiers of the Church, yet with which the members of the Church are inescapably bound up, must be viewed not just as one from which new converts are to be drawn into the life of the Church, but which otherwise is to be left untouched as outside the sphere of Christian interest, but as one which itself is included within the scope of the redeeming power of the Gospel. It is the transformation of the common life, the re-creation of the social order by the impact of the Gospel, as proclaimed in its full range, which is integral to the missionary aim.

Nor, in fact, is this wider and more far-reaching aim being left out of sight. Perhaps the most striking trend in its effects on the pattern of life in the East is the rapid process of industrialization which is so marked a feature of our time. This is, of course, no new departure in Japan, the very life of whose people, in face of the increasing pressure of over-population, depends on the mass-production of manufactured goods for distribution in the markets of the world. But the process of industrialization is at work, too, in Indonesia, in India, and in Africa, and is presenting a challenge to the Church which it is increasingly seeking to meet. It sees here, in the factory and the life which centres in the factory, a field of evangelism which it is called to enter, in order not only to make converts from it, and to give spiritual support to Christians engaged in it, but to bring to bear upon it those fundamental truths as to the rights of personality, and as to the basis of human relationships,

for which the Christian faith stands. It is, to give an outstanding example, to meet this challenge that Professors of Industrial Relations have been appointed to the theological seminaries in Japan, that theological students are encouraged to accept temporary work in factories, and that Christian Labour schools are organized in which lectures are given on the history and structure of Industry, particularly in reference to Japan, and the bearing of the Christian faith upon it; the whole movement serving to illustrate in living fact the truth that Christianity is not a matter only of the individual, and of his life in the Church, but of his life as a whole, a spiritual force destined under God to transform the whole social order.

Perhaps, however, the implication of this larger and more far-reaching missionary aim can best be illustrated in terms of our own country, rather than of countries overseas in reference to which the term "missionary" is commonly used. In 1945 a Report was presented to the Church Assembly under the title *Towards the Conversion of England*. It was deservedly "received" at the time as a clear and weighty expression of the mission of evangelization to which the Church in this country is committed. Yet the very definition of evangelism which stands at its head[5] is clear evidence of the limits within which the mission was conceived; and it is no disparagement of a notable Report, and no reflection on the vital importance of the challenge which it presented to the Church, to say that the assumption underlying it throughout was that a Christian England was an England in which the largest possible proportion of its people were professing and practising Christians. Evangelism was conceived almost exclusively in terms of the individual, as his acceptance of Christ as Lord and his incorporation into the living fellowship of the Church.

There is no question that the necessity of conversion in that sense is an essential condition of the fulfilment of the larger aim. There can, indeed, be no Christian England without a strengthening and extension of the believing, worshipping community of the Church. Experience has conclusively shown that it is only where there is already a strong central focus of converted Christians, whether in the parish or in wider areas, that any effective impact can be made on those without, whether in their individual or their communal capacity. It can, however, still be questioned whether evangelization as defined, and considered in detail, in

the Report goes far enough. Great as is the aim which it set before the Church, that aim is not so much an end in itself as an essential means to the end. For the Gospel as proclaimed in its fulness includes in its scope not the individual only and his life in the Church, but his life without and the whole setting and environment within which his life is lived and his work is done; and, if in overseas missionary spheres there is a pressing need to keep in view the larger aim to which missionary strategy should be directed, that need is *a fortiori* urgent here. We were reminded by Mr T. S. Eliot in his well-known book *The Idea of a Christian Society* that there is a wide distinction between a community of Christians and a Christian community. It is, indeed, abundantly clear that a nation, a large proportion, even the great majority of whose citizens profess and practise the Christian faith, can yet fall far short of a Christian nation, Christian, that is, in its corporate life and at every level and in every sphere of its corporate life. The testimony of history goes to show that a large-scale organized common enterprise, for example that of Industry, however far those exercising a controlling influence in it are themselves sincere Christians and would repudiate any allegation to the contrary, can yet be un-Christian or sub-Christian in its working assumptions as to the nature of man, the purpose of human life, and the human relationships on which it is based. What applies to Industry applies equally to the political field. It may well be that politics is the science of the possible, and not of the ideal. It is certainly true that a Government, the members of which are sincere Christians, is no guarantee of a policy, domestic or foreign, in which primary regard is paid to "the first principles of Christ",[6] and we can only then speak of a Christian England when we mean by the term something more than an England the majority of whose people are professing Christians, and imply by it an England which in every aspect and sphere of its many-sided corporate life has yielded to the impact of the spirit of Christ; and has been, or is in process of being, transformed from within outwards by the leavening power of the Gospel.

It has lately been suggested in more than one quarter that the term "Kingdom of God", deriving as it does from the highest source, is that which best gives expression to the wider aim to which the times are demanding that the Mission of the Church should be directed, and might well be its challenging watchword. For the implication of the term is that of a realm within which human

life as a whole stands under law to God. It is that realm, therefore, which is not coterminous with the institutional Church, however far the Church is the divinely ordained instrument of its establishment. Its scope is all those spheres of secular activity which, while autonomous within their own limits, are yet subject to that higher law under which all human life stands. It is, accordingly, the mission of the Church not to claim domination over this vast realm, but to proclaim that higher law in its relevance to it, and to seek to leaven it through and through with the spirit of Christ. The exacting nature of the demand which such a mission makes on the Church which accepts it is obvious, involving as it does nothing less than a rethinking, and reassertion, of the Gospel in terms of the whole life of our time.

At the same time the challenge with which the Church in this country was confronted in the sermon preached in St Paul's Cathedral in February 1957 by the Archdeacon of London, and since published,[7] should not go unheeded. In it he called for a National Mission, planned and carried through not only in terms of the whole country, but in those of the whole life of the country. The importance of the challenge lies not so much in the scale, in terms of area and extension, on which the proposed Mission should be undertaken (with regard to which there may well be differences of opinion), but in the burden of the message with which it would be charged. "This age", we were told, "demands a Gospel which speaks to the condition of communal man." Here, indeed, is the kernel of the matter. At the same time, it is one thing to state the truth in general terms, but it is quite another, as the preacher indeed pointed out, to discover and call into play the resources of knowledge and of prophetic insight and power on which the Church must count in undertaking a campaign so far-reaching in its scope. Nor can anything that is said upon this larger aim imply any depreciation of the importance of evangelization and conversion in the commonly accepted sense. It still remains true that the larger aim which, in response to the demand of our time, the Church should set itself is "the salvation and re-creation of society as a whole, whether society is thought of as the family, the nation, or the world". It is this, and nothing less than this, which is implied in the petition for the coming of the Kingdom. It is to this, and nothing less than this, that the Church is called to address itself, if it is to fulfil its God-given missionary aim whether within the

frontiers of this country or in the prevailingly non-Christian countries overseas.

1 Vol. CLVII, No. 325; Vol. CLVIII, No. 326.

2 Isa. 54. 2.

3 2 Cor. 11. 14.

4 Matt. 28. 19.

5 "To evangelize is so to present Christ Jesus in the power of the Holy Spirit, that men shall come to put their trust in God through Him, to accept Him as their Saviour, and to serve Him as their King in the fellowship of His Church."

6 Heb. 6. 1.

7 *Message for a Mission* (Mowbrays).

MICHAEL FURSE

CYRIL E. HUDSON

"THERE were giants in those days." So the older generation is notoriously apt to reflect, recalling the heroes and leaders of its youth. The present writer is well aware of this tendency, but aware also that time flies and memories are short, and that it is now fourteen years since Michael Furse ceased to be at the centre of things, and four years since he died. Already he is hardly more than a name and a legend to the majority of the present clergy of the diocese of St Albans, which he ruled with conspicuous success for a quarter of a century. What follows is offered as a small contribution towards the keeping of his memory green.

Stand Therefore!,[1] which appeared in 1953, was in form autobiographical, but the sub-title—"A Bishop's Testimony of Faith in the Church of England"—describes its essential character; for Furse was less interested in the story of his own life than in the lessons to be drawn from the record, and particularly in the support it afforded, as he believed, to the claim of the Church to be "not only an integral part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ", but to have "a unique part to play in the reconversion of England to the Christian Faith". His own character afforded weighty support to the argument.

It was an integrated character. But integration is a process and an achievement: the discipline and harmony of diverse, and even conflicting elements. Such unification is never complete and absolute this side of the grave, and therefore each of the separate strands will from time to time be in evidence. In so dynamic and supercharged a personality as Furse's, moreover, each factor tended on occasion to seem exaggerated and overdrawn. He was, in consequence, never without his critics, though even they were wont to admit that what they regarded as his weaknesses were the defects of his qualities.

Three or four years after Furse married and left Oxford to become Archdeacon of Johannesburg,[2] there appeared a novel of

university life entitled *Keddy*, by H. N. Dickinson. Its principal theme was religious, and many of the characters were easily recognizable, notably William Temple and Michael Furse, who appeared in the guise of "Tatham" and "Colquhoun", though the author sought to cover his tracks by making Tatham an "advanced", and Colquhoun a "modernist" churchman. The book gives a highly-coloured and prejudiced picture of certain Oxford circles; it is only referred to here because Colquhoun is portrayed in an exceedingly unamiable light: a beefy, loud-voiced, overbearing clerical don, who achieves his ends by not over-scrupulous means. This, of course, was caricature rather than criticism, the work of a hostile, not of a sympathetic observer. Yet it was generally allowed by his contemporaries that Furse owed no little of his success in the disciplinary duties of his office as Dean of Trinity to his ability to deal with toughs and rowdies in something like their own coin. An occasion is recalled when, after a bump supper or some such festivity, two undergraduates were trying to wrench the lid off a coal-bin belonging to the college. As Furse approached across the grass, one of them, who was in no state to recognize the Dean, said: "You look a hefty feller: give a hand and help us to get this bally top off." "No", said the Dean, "Get it off yourselves; then I'll shove you both inside and put the lid back again." Recognition followed, and the two young men, well aware that Furse certainly could, and probably would, carry out his threat, took to their heels.

In later years there were many who found themselves opposed by the forcefulness and energy which Furse never hesitated to exert when confronted by what he was convinced was sloth, or malingering, or neglect of duty. And there were some, guilty of none of these sins, who found his driving "activism" a little hard to bear. Among the papers he left behind him was a packet of letters (most of them very long ones) addressed to Bishop Carter of Pretoria (afterwards Archbishop of Capetown) by a priest of the diocese who greatly resented what he regarded as an invasion of the rights and responsibilities of the parochial clergy by the imperious fire-eater who had just come out from England as Archdeacon of Johannesburg. He complains that, in his enthusiasm and impatience with slow-moving churchfolk, Furse is apt to exceed his archidiaconal functions and authority, and he draws the Bishop's attention to a lack of restraint in language (so full of "gabbling and yapping")

which goes far beyond "outspokenness". He pleads for a meeting, under the Bishop's chairmanship, at which the Archdeacon can be confronted by his critics. The meeting took place, but the complainants seem to have been no match for the Archdeacon, for a few days later the writer gently chides the Bishop for having allowed Furse to steal the show. "Quite unconsciously, my dear Bishop," he remarks sadly, "you were not fair to *us*, for you permitted Furse to address the meeting, and not the Chair, as we had to do. And you know as well as I do that Furse in a room with ten men will be in possession in ten minutes!" He confesses to having himself been "lifted off my feet by Furse's speech; it required some thinking to come back to one's reasoned position".

The correspondence from which these quotations are taken includes also several letters from Furse to the Bishop, These are, for the most part, closely argued, point by point refutations of the complaints made against him; and they give the impression that, in those early years, he had little comprehension of the possible harm to his ministry which might be done by his forcefulness of manner and speech. In actual fact, however, he was already beginning to learn this lesson. He never ceased to learn it; a letter to a friend, written in 1947, reveals how conscious he continued to be, down to the close of his life, of the temptation inherent in the sheer force of his personality. "When you pray for me," he wrote, "pray that I may not let self-righteousness blind me, or allow the revel of the battle to carry me away so as to forget courtesy and charity towards those whose opinions I may feel bound to contend with."

"The revel of the battle." He loved it, unashamedly. He must be sure that it was a battle in which he could, and indeed must, conscientiously engage "in the name of the Lord", but, that point settled, he plunged delightedly into the fray, with colours flying and no quarter given or expected. He was frequently indiscreet. In 1915, while Bishop of Pretoria, he spoke many wild and whirling words in criticism of the Chaplain General's department of the War Office, and even of the Archbishop (Davidson), in the course of his efforts to goad the powers that be into remedying what he regarded as a scandalous deficiency in the provision of Anglican Chaplains to the Forces.[3] This campaign, which he waged in speeches up and down England, produced a gentle rebuke from the Bishop of Winchester, Edward Talbot, a dear and trusted friend, who wrote:

My dear Mike,

You really mustn't. It isn't true: and it isn't right: and it may do infinite harm if you go about the country proclaiming that men like the Archbishops don't care. York's visit to the Fleet and report thereon gave rather a smacking answer, so far as he is concerned, given the day after I read a flaming letter from ———— [a member of the Furse family]. As to Canterbury, "every man has his own gift". Yours—and Prince Rupert's—is one, of dash and fire and charges. But another is that of the man who handles the main battle, and lifts the heavy burden of daily administration, and keeps the chiefs in touch and harmony with one another. And that is the gift which has been used, with unflagging industry and patience and considerateness, week in and week out all these long and weary months at Lambeth. . . . . And now after eleven months we are just beginning! Since M.P. has taken things up. . . . . I quite think that the C.G.'s department was snowed under, and lacked quick decision in developing new organisation for the crisis. But the old fellow [Bishop Taylor Smith] has worked like a Trojan, and largely cast off his partisanship, and tried to back up anyone who was doing good work.

Always, dear man,

Yours sincerely in aff. & brotherly regard,

E. Winton.

It was after his visit to the French battlefields in this year, 1915, that Furse wrote a two-column letter to *The Times*, then edited by his friend Geoffrey Dawson, drawing attention to the shortage of shells, and pleading for universal conscription.[4] (He did not actually use the word, but he asked rhetorically whether the newly-formed coalition Government was going to rely "on the same ridiculous principles of voluntary service as heretofore".) This letter caused a sensation. *The Times* immediately reprinted it as a halfpenny pamphlet, and hundreds of thousands of copies were circulated throughout the Empire. It had a mixed reception in England. Those who condemned Furse's frank and unashamed entry, as it seemed to them, into the political field were not slow to point out that he had played most obligingly, if unwittingly, into the hands of Lord Northcliffe in his vendetta against Mr Asquith and Lord Kitchener, which had been waged for many months in his newspapers, *The Times* and *The Daily Mail*.[5] What the public did not know was that Dawson made great efforts to postpone for some time Furse's return to his diocese in South Africa, and to keep him in England as what he called "Bishop of the Back", a large part of whose duty it would

be to tour the country and rouse the munition workers to a greater sense of their responsibility. Dawson made this suggestion to Lloyd George, the Minister of Munitions, who thought it "an admirable one", and asked, "Whose permission ought I to get to keep the Bishop of Pretoria in this country?" Dawson wrote also to Furse, begging him "for Heaven's sake not to turn this down as a ridiculous project", even though it was unlikely "to commend itself either to the P.M. or to Cantuar". Furse was far from turning it down; on the contrary, he replied at once that "it seems to me to have quite a lot in it". But he could only undertake such a task "provided Lloyd George as Minister of Munitions is prepared to ask me definitely to give a hand so far as I can in this job". He had no doubt that, armed with such a request from "a person like Lloyd George", the Archbishop of Cape Town and the Vicar-General of his own diocese of Pretoria would acquiesce in the postponement of his return: "I shouldn't worry", he added characteristically, "about Cantuar or anyone else." Writing to Dawson a fortnight later, however, he was less certain that his duty did not lie in immediate return; nevertheless, he continued up to the moment of sailing to hold himself in readiness for a summons from Lloyd George. Providentially, it did not come; and the Bishop of Pretoria returned to his diocese.[6]

He would have been impatient with the questioning of his judgement implied in the previous sentence. For he did really think of the war in terms of a Crusade. "Recent events have clearly shown", he wrote in his *Times* letter, "that we are in a perfectly real sense up against the Devil incarnate, fighting against an enemy who will stop at nothing, however mean and cruel and disgusting—an enemy who will use gas, sink Lusitanias, put arsenic in running streams, and sow disease." He was "absolutely convinced", he told the annual conference of the Mothers' Union, "that this is a holy war, and that we are fighting for the Faith". These opinions, which were widely publicized, were by no means accepted without qualification by all his fellow-churchmen, and it is easy to imagine the storm of criticism and controversy within the Church which would have been aroused if he had stumped the country with a roving commission from the Ministry of Munitions. Yet there is no evidence that he foresaw this disastrous possibility.

The truth is that there was a large element of the prophetic in Furse's make-up, and that he found it difficult to see a problem in

all its aspects, or to see more than one thing at a time. In a certain sense, the prophet's is a one-track mind. A further illustration of this may be seen in the line he took, from which he never deviated by a hair's-breadth, on the subject of the admission to Holy Communion of those who have remarried after divorce. He took his stand, logically enough, on the express prescription of Canon Law (No. 107 of the Canons of 1604) that a man and wife permitted by the Church to *separate* "shall live chastely and continently, neither shall they, during each other's life, contract matrimony with any other person"; on the incontrovertibly plain teaching of the Marriage Service, that marriage is a union terminable only by the death of one of the parties; and on the demand (in the Catechism and elsewhere) for repentance and amendment of life in the communicant. Until the Church alters her view of the nature of marriage, thus so clearly defined, it is impossible, he held, to contemplate the admission to Communion of those who by their own conduct have advertised to the world that they reject that view.[7]

This was the position which Furse maintained till the day of his death. He was impatient with the attempt, commonly made, to distinguish between *two* duties of the Church: first, that of upholding her own standard and doctrine, which she discharges by refusing to "re-marry" a couple in church, either of whom has been through the divorce court; and, secondly, her pastoral responsibility to those who have fallen by the wayside. He was apt to be somewhat contemptuous of the facile plea (as he regarded it) that "life is wider than logic"; and many of those who chattered about "charity" he regarded as unprincipled sentimentalists: must charity, he asked, make us indifferent to truth? Moreover, he was inclined, while giving due respect to the learning of a moral theologian like Bishop Kirk, to be suspicious of arguments based upon the doctrine of "invincible ignorance", which he sometimes regarded as designed to circumvent a difficulty instead of facing it.

Furse argued his case with passion and power, notably in the long debates in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury in January 1937, when he and Bishop Bernard Heywood of Ely found themselves in a minority of two in opposing Resolutions which would have authorized diocesan bishops to give permission, in certain carefully-defined circumstances, for remarried *divorcés* to be admitted to Communion.[8] It must be confessed that these

debates make rather sad reading to-day. The Bishop of Chichester, Dr Bell, who took a prominent part in them, writes[9] of Furse's "immense zest", and of the "strong impression" which he always made "by his sincerity and the sheer force of his personality"; but he goes on to say that this divorce question "was not in his view a matter which was arguable. He could not see any possibility of compromise." He could not indeed. To him it seemed obvious that the proposed concession carried with it the inescapable implication that divorce proceedings in a civil court had dissolved a union which the Church regards as indissoluble. If the bishops' proposals did not mean this, what did they mean? Did they mean that, in certain circumstances, bigamists and adulterers were to be admitted to Holy Communion? To the end of his life Furse remained convinced that, neither in the Convocation debates nor afterwards, had his brother-bishops answered these questions. And indeed it cannot be denied that the advocates of some relaxation of the rigorism which would seem to be implicit in the Anglican formularies have shown a marked reluctance to define the *ecclesiastical status* of a marriage which has been dissolved by legal process. Either in some sense the union still persists, or it does not. In what sense, if any? If not, why prohibit the subsequent marriage of either party from being solemnized in church? Furse refused to separate the prohibition of certain marriages from the excommunication incurred by those who contract them: the one sanction, he insisted, implied the other—prohibition and excommunication were one thing, not two.

His own method of dealing with these cases is described in *Stand Therefore!* (page 169):

> The bishop, acting in the name of the Church, should tell the party who was willing to cease cohabitation that he or she can and should rely upon the uncovenanted mercies of God, "and do what they can"—namely, accept the excommunication which they have brought upon themselves by their own action, and offer up to God all that is incurred by it in at least some reparation for disregarding his law, and in witness to the righteousness of that law.
>
> Secondly, that they should hold on faithfully to their prayers, the study of the Bible, and to regular attendance at public worship, including the Service of Holy Communion, but *without presenting themselves at the altar rails.* If they honestly try to do this, the Church can assure them God will accept such an offering and bless it.

It saddened the Bishop greatly to reflect that "our opponents (i.e.

his own and Bishop Heywood's) never seriously even considered the plan on which I had worked in South Africa and in England for over thirty-five years". There was in this regret, however, no trace of self-pity, which "has always", he once wrote to a friend, "seemed to me the most despicable and devastating of all forms of selfishness". On the other hand, he was encouraged to receive, from time to time, letters from people who had, perhaps reluctantly, and even resentfully at first, followed his counsel and were able, in some cases many years later, to thank him for it. Such letters reinforced his own vigorous faith that, as he wrote to one such correspondent, "it is an enormous help, when we are faced with difficulties or disappointments or apparent failure or suffering, if, instead of letting them oppress us, we ask God to help us boldly to take hold of them, and offer them up to our Lord in union with His Sacrifice. I do not mean that it is an easy thing to do, but it is possible, but only through the grace of God." When the Bishop pressed arduous and heroic courses upon people, he never allowed it to be supposed that they would be able to follow his advice in reliance on their own resources. He did most heartily subscribe to William Temple's view that Pelagianism is "the one intrinsically damnable heresy"; but this was balanced by his insistence on the constant availability of the infinite resources of God. He was always at his best when leading others in prayer, and many who had the privilege of belonging to such groups of "pray-ers" will recall the frequent occurrence of certain rotund and well-worn phrases: "the power of Thy Spirit to make us equal to each and every task that comes our way" was one of which he was particularly fond.

He had a disconcerting way of insisting that those who disagreed with him should follow their argument to its logical end. This made him an adept at framing awkward questions. "And where would you put her?" he asked a man who complained that his vicar had preached a sermon in which he had spoken of the Blessed Virgin Mary as "exalted at the right hand of Christ". He was always tempted, moreover, to regard as temporizers and shilly-shallyers those who could not or (as it seemed to him) would not see moral and spiritual issues in the plain black and white colours in which they appeared to him, and were in consequence slow to make pronouncements or to "get a move on". "I sometimes smile when I think of you at our Bishops' Meetings", wrote Cosmo Ebor, when congratulating him on his appointment to St Albans in 1920, "and

I wonder how you will endure them." They often tried him sorely, and he found it hard to be patient with what he regarded as excesses of episcopal caution and discretion. Legend has it that conversation with a visitor was interrupted by a continuous hammering in the vicinity of Abbey Gate House. When he and the visitor had bellowed at each other for some time the latter asked what on earth the row was. "That noise?" said Mike. "Oh, that's for old so-and-so (naming an exalted episcopal personage). He's coming down to-morrow, and I'm having a fence put up for him to sit on!"

Furse has told the story of his South African episcopate in his autobiography. But something may be said here to supplement his own references to "the Native Question". He was of course well aware, and never ceased to emphasize, that "the primary problem is not the Native, but the White Question, or, in other words, the attitude of the European population towards the Africans living under the Government of the Union of South Africa". The Africans themselves were in no doubt of the Bishop's concern for them. The Bishop quotes in full the Address presented to him on his departure by his Native clergy: ". . . we had learned always to look to you as a father for help and protection, for we knew that in all matters your judgement was quite impartial. Under your rule we expected and did get sympathy, justice and human treatment . . . Our protector is to-day going away . . ." (A priest who signed this Address recalls that the Bishop's solicitude extended to the smallest details: "He used to tell us to dress smartly, and see that our collars were the right size!") While the Diocesan Synod was in session in 1918 the Bishop received a letter from the President of the South African Native Labourers' Association, who wrote in the name of the Association "and of the majority of the Natives and Coloureds, to thank your Lordship for the fearless manner in which you have spoken on behalf of the Black Races of Africa. You, my Lord, have shown us what the meaning of the Word 'Christian' is. May God in his mercy send more such Shepherds from England the same as his Servant Michael Bolton, to fight as the great St Michael fought against Satan and his Apostate Angels. . . . Thanking you, my Lord, for the Interest and the Fearless outspokenness the attitude of God's prophets as of Old that you have taken up . . ."

On the eve of his departure for England the Bishop addressed an Open Letter to General Smuts, the Prime Minister of the Union (see

Stand Therefore!).[10] Reading it, one recalls that, when congratulating Furse on his appointment to an English see, the Archbishop of York, Cosmo Gordon Lang, had written: "I am very sorry, really sorry that you are leaving South Africa. I had always hoped that you would be able to make the building up of the Church there your great life's work. It would have been well worth doing." The loss to South Africa, and to the Church of the Province, sustained by Furse's departure was immeasurably great.

One at least of the suggestions in the Open Letter—all of which had their inspiration, as the Bishop claimed, in his own experience —bore fruit:[11] this was the proposal that a "Native Affairs Commission" should be set up to "advise the Government of the day on all matters relating to Native questions". It was to consist of "three men of high standing and proved capacity", who were to have security of tenure and to hold office for a long term. The "Native Affairs Act" of 1920 made provision for the appointment of such a Commission. Its first members were men of wisdom and moral stature, and in its early years, by means of its studies of the conditions of Native life, and its drafting of legislation affecting Natives, the Commission commanded considerable respect, and did much to fulfil its self-declared principles: *viz.* to be the friend of the Natives, and to consider sympathetically their needs, aspirations, and progress; to seek to win their confidence; and to strive to educate public opinion, so as to bring about the most harmonious relations possible between White and Black in South Africa. The Act of 1920 has not, as Furse appears to have thought, been repealed. But appointments to the Commission have in recent years tended to be made on party lines, and it no longer enjoys its former reputation for independent judgement. In May 1951 it was officially laid down that the Commission should play an active part in promoting *apartheid*.

Furse left South Africa long before Afrikaner nationalism had reached its present intensity, and before the word *apartheid* (if it was used at all) had come to shock the conscience of the civilized world—though it is clear, not only from the Open Letter, but from his personal correspondence, and from a Memorandum which he circulated privately in 1918, that he was well aware of the dangers attaching to failure to check the tensions which existed in his day, not only between White and Black but between Afrikaners and

British. As early as 1911 he wrote to a friend in England that "my Natives are becoming a bit restive. They will need a lot of handling. It's going on all over the place, but the fool white man goes on in blissful ignorance, thinking all is well . . . The Native won't sit still and quiet for ever: of that I'm sure." In his retirement at Wantage after leaving St Albans in 1944 he had plenty of time to brood, deeply and grimly, upon the progress of events in "the Beloved Country". He was horrified, indignant, and sad, as act after act of the Government, and speech after speech by the Nationalist leaders, seemed to put the real and (as he thought them) sinister intentions of the party in power beyond the possibility of doubt. He foresaw disaster ahead. He knew that the external circumstances of the Native problem had changed greatly since his day, and for this reason he was careful to refrain from public comment, either in speeches or in letters to the Press; he resisted, on the ground that he was a "back number", great pressure brought to bear on him to express his personal opinions on the present situation in *Stand Therefore!* But he made no secret of these opinions in private conversation and correspondence. He saw clearly that the issues at stake, like every other political issue in the last analysis, are essentially theological and moral. And never, even in his darkest mood, did he doubt that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men". If his gloomiest forebodings were to be realized, that would be proof—and here he showed himself to be in the true succession of the prophets, from Amos and Isaiah down to his own beloved teacher, Charles Gore—not that the purposes of Providence can be finally frustrated, but that men's pride and rebellion against the Divine will are a mere impotent battering against reality, having their inevitable and self-imposed consequences in doom and disaster.

Furse became Bishop of St Albans in 1920, with a reputation for wise and courageous leadership already made, first as Archdeacon of Johannesburg and then as Bishop of Pretoria.[12] His inner life had been tested by the purifying fire of the death of his only child, a universally beloved and promising girl of 14.[13] The striking impression which he made at his Enthronement foreshadowed what he was to prove himself to the diocese to be. His physical stature was matched by his bigness of character: large-hearted and generous, expansive and far-sighted in his plans and enterprises. There was an endearing unaffectedness and ease about him. He had wrung power from experience, and could sympathize as well as

rule. There was in his public utterances no pretentiousness or cant, no facile use of *clichés*, but unadorned, colloquial, and often humorous speech. Even on the greatest occasions, when he bore himself as a great prelate and prince of the Church, one felt there was no posing. This was just *right*: the man and the circumstances were matched: you knew he was not thinking about himself but about what he was doing. Even his natural histrionic talent never led him astray into any falsity of tone or "play-acting" when dealing with the eternal issues in the pulpit or on the platform. If in preaching or speaking a joke came handy to illustrate his point or to relieve the tension, out he came with it spontaneously; and the laugh that followed made his audience more vulnerable to the impact of what he was driving home. His voice never took on pious tones or inflections. He spoke to a multitude with the simple directness of personal contact. The combination of "non-U" phraseology with an unmistakably "U" voice sometimes gave his words a peculiar piquancy.

What came to him by nature was nurtured by grace. As the years passed, he became more and more truly what he longed to be: a Father in God to his people. All the old forcefulness and vigour were still there in full measure, but now tempered and mellowed, in the course of long years of rigorous self-discipline and self-dedication to the will of God, daily renewed at the Cathedral altar, by gentleness and patience and a genuine and profound humility. Long past now are the South African days when an intimate woman friend felt obliged to write, in reference to some of his utterances as reported in the Press: "You may say these things in fun, but I hear that you look so fierce and angry when you say them that most folk take them seriously."[14]

He had not been Bishop of St Albans long before the diocese began to feel the refreshing and revivifying influence of his personality. Something new was in the air—a gale rather than a breeze—and St Albans began to have a reputation for pioneering experiments. Things that are commonplaces now seemed startingly original thirty years ago: the revival of diocesan Synods and the creation of the Bishop's Senate, two safeguards against despotism; the elevation of the status of the Rural Dean; the biennial Diocesan Festivals; the annual "Diocesan Family Parties", and parties on a smaller scale for "Husbands and Wives" and "Boys and Girls"; Refresher Courses for the clergy; Schools of Prayer for priests and

for layfolk.[15] Many of these gatherings took place in the Diocesan House, which was opened in 1926.

Driving energy, forthright denunciation of the evil and the shoddy and the second-rate, boundless sympathy, and an ebullient joyfulness which he retained to the end: these were the qualities which remain in the memories of those who knew him best. But "caring matters most", as Von Hügel said. And no one could doubt that Mike cared. The following extracts from a letter written, immediately after his death, by a man who from boyhood had known him well and, with his wife, had paid visits to Wantage in the last sad years after the stroke which he suffered in 1948, reflect the experience of many others:

> We always marvelled at the refreshment, the "life more abundant" that we took away with us every time we saw him. It was astounding—the rejuvenation and the renewal of life and happiness that he could give out when he was so ill and decrepit and "dragging his miserable old body about". He might so well have been demanding sympathy and bewailing his desolate condition, yet it was totally unlike that, and he was a well-spring of life and vigour and hope and happiness. He always restored my ever-flagging self-respect and knocked away the negative things and gave me a chance to move on again towards positive hopes and aims. Again and again he did that. Nobody but ———— [the writer's wife] and my father have had such a strong, upholding effect for me, and Mike's has been so true and strong that I really feel he did set me squarely on my feet some time ago, and, remembering him, I will try to go on now without his present help.

A full-length biography of Michael Furse, if it followed a contemporary fashion, would subject his character to a penetrating psychological analysis. No such analysis is attempted here. But no one could meet him, or study any photograph taken in his maturity, and not see in his face the signs of hidden fires, or fail to recognize that this was a complex, though now a unified and integrated personality. It is likely that the psychologist of one school (after glancing at the fact that Furse and his wife had only one child) might be inclined to regard as probably "compensatory" the Bishop's preoccupation, at one period of his life, with a particular range of problems. And it is true that his concern with questions relating to marriage, divorce, and birth-control sometimes seemed almost to amount, in the eyes of those nearest to him, to a compulsive obsession. No one could doubt that the sole conscious inspiration of

this concern was religious and theological; yet it is not impossible that the very strength of his convictions, and the passion with which he expressed them, may have represented the overflow —the unconscious sublimation—of elements in his psychology otherwise imperfectly fulfilled. But this is hypothetical. A less speculative line of enquiry may be suggested, perhaps, in terms of Jung's doctrine of *anima* and *animus*. The words refer to the latent, unconscious elements in the personality of man and woman respectively, and the simplest and least controversial part of the doctrine draws attention to the fact, familiar to everyone, that many men have a strong feminine, and many women a strong masculine component in their psychological constitution. The *anima* in Furse may be thought to have revealed itself most obviously, perhaps, in his hand-writing, which was very beautiful, but clearly of a feminine type. It appeared also in his reliance on his intuitions: "I know it in my bones", he would say. He had, moreover, a great number of women friends; with some of those whom he saw infrequently he maintained a regular correspondence over long periods of years. It is probable that the bond of sympathy in these friendships was forged by the feminine rather than by the masculine elements in his character. One of these friends, asked what it was in Furse that had drawn her to him, replied at once: "Oh, what you call his femininity, most certainly. When I first knew him, I admired him, and respected him—and was rather terrified of him; one had the feeling that he might trample you underfoot one day! But what I quickly grew to love in him was his gentleness, his patience, and his instinctive capacity to understand." The validity of this reference to the *anima* receives further indirect support from the experience of the few women in whose houses he was an occasional and very welcome guest during the last two or three years of his life, when he required a good deal of attention and could do little for himself; for they all agree that his own complete self-effacement and naturalness made it easy for them to help him without the least embarrassment or self-consciousness. One of them writes:

> The Bishop was a most cheerful and uncomplaining guest, in spite of considerable neglect on my part (I was doing the day nursing of my husband, and had only rather sketchy domestic comers-in). He found a bathroom miles from his bedroom, and left his shaving things there and couldn't find them in the morning. He sat on his

bedsocks while my husband's nurse ransacked his suitcases to find them. He got his braces in a tangle that any music-hall clown would envy. He dropped his stick, and occasionally spilled his food—and never showed a sign of impatience. And he gave immense pleasure to the man who drove him back from church by remembering his wife's uncle, whom he had had with him for a short time in South Africa.

What was the secret of this man's power and influence? The triumphant sanity of his outlook on men and things? His sanctity? His dynamism—or his tenderness? People will vary in their answers. Who shall say what it was in Michael Furse that so greatly moved a dying soldier whom he visited in a field dressing-station in France in 1915? The man had been terribly wounded, and knew that he had only a short time to live. He was lying face downwards and could not move. When the Bishop had talked to him and prayed with him and blessed him and said good-bye, he asked: "Will you do me a favour, sir? Will you kneel down again so I can look at your face again before you go?"[16]

1 S.P.C.K.

2 1903-9.

3 To the end of his life Furse held very strongly that the Army ought to have a Bishop. "He felt it to be quite anomalous", writes the Bishop of Chichester, "that so large a body of men, with so large a number of Anglican chaplains ministering to them, should be without the direct spiritual guidance of a Bishop. He had no sort of wish to interfere with or embarrass the regular administration of the Chaplains Department through the Chaplain-General and his staff. But it was a point of principle with him that besides administration there should be a chief shepherd to whom the chaplains, and therefore the men they served, could look up as a Father in God. This proposal was regarded with great sympathy by some of the highest military authorities, but Furse found it impossible to get his principle accepted in practice. (A very small step towards it was taken during the second World War, when Leslie Owen was consecrated as Bishop of Maidstone, with a special charge in connection with army ordination candidates as part of his duties as Chairman of C.A.C.T.M.)."

4 The writer is indebted to the Hon. Mrs Geoffrey Dawson for her kindness in allowing the use of her husband's correspondence which is made here.

5 Gilbert Murray, in a letter to *The Westminster Gazette* which included a derogatory reference to the demands of "the Bishop of Popocatapetl", wrote that, "owing perhaps to an undue fastidiousness", he "happened never to have read a copy of *The Daily Mail*", and that he had now given up reading *The Times*.

6 Five years later Lloyd George nominated him to the Crown for the see of St Albans. "I couldn't help it any more than you could", he told his Diocesan Conference: "I was simply thrown at you by a Baptist Prime Minister."

7 It is possible that the Bishop owed something of his rigorism to the influence of the learned Fr F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E., who had written, in the course of his answer to certain questions addressed to him from South Africa in 1912, that "dispensations, allowing persons living in adultery to communicate, are of course unknown and inconceivable. If *per impossibile* a Christian priest were to be ordered by his Bishop to communicate persons, one or both of whom had married, after being divorced, during the lifetime of the other partner to the former marriage, it would be the duty of the priest to suffer any penalty, whether spiritual or temporal, however extreme, rather than obey so criminal an order. It would be infinitely better to be degraded from the priesthood and excommunicated, or chopped in pieces or burnt, than to be cast into hell."

8 Circumstances defined more strictly, it may be noted, than in the regulations passed by both Houses in June 1957, which have the authority of an Act of Convocation. This Act enjoins that a Bishop, before directing a parish priest to admit such persons to the sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, or Holy Communion, shall satisfy himself "that the parties concerned are in good faith, and that their receiving of the Sacraments would be for the good of their souls, and ought not to be a cause of offence to the Church". Furse would have wanted to know what "in good faith" means. Is penitence for having contracted the existing union implied?—if so, why does not the Act mention it?

9 In a letter to the writer.

10 Smuts described it (in a private letter of farewell) as "a noble parting word from you, which will do much good".

11 In the following paragraph the writer is indebted to the Hon. Richard Feetham, C.M.G., formerly Judge of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of South Africa.

12 The three following paragraphs owe much to the recollections (which are in places quoted *verbatim*) of Bishop Lumsden Barkway, Furse's devoted and beloved colleague as Bishop Suffragan of Bedford, 1935-8 (Bishop of St Andrews, 1938-49).

13 The Jane Furse Hospital in Sekukuniland was founded in her memory.

14 One who was a "leading layman" when Furse was Archdeacon of Johannesburg writes: "It sometimes fell to my lot to pour oil on troubled waters, and it was then especially that I recognized the dear fellow he was. He once wrote me one of the most delightful letters I have ever received, in which he thanked me for having pointed out to him the serious consequences of some unwise remarks which he had made publicly. Only a big man could have written such a letter. He never bore any animosity."

15 When they heard that the first Boys' and Girls' Conference was being planned, both Archbishops (Davidson and Lang) scouted the idea that anybody would come: the former was quite sure that no boys would, anyway—they were much too self-conscious. However, the acceptances exceeded the accommodation available at the Diocesan House, and at the end of the Conference nearly everyone put his or her name down for the following year. So it was year after year, and there were always more boys than girls. A woman who, with her husband, attended the first Husbands' and Wives' Conference, recalls that they were both extremely nervous, and were quite prepared to bolt if they felt like it. "But we enjoyed every minute. Mike's marvellous vitality and enthusiasm were so infectious, and he had a wonderful way of making things go and putting everyone at their ease. We came

away longing for more. I rushed off at a moment's notice to tell a Mothers' Union branch all about it." In those days very few of those who attended had come across "group discussions", by which the Bishop set great store: they loosened tongues most effectively.

16 The authority for this incident is one of the "circular" letters which the Bishop wrote to members of his family during his visit to the Front.

CORRESPONDENCE

JOANNA SOUTHCOTT

SIR,—In connection with the review of G. R. Balleine's book on Joanna Southcott in the latest issue of the *C.Q.R.*, wherein it is suggested that her box may some day be opened, it is interesting to note that several requests were made to Archbishop Davidson at intervals from 1915 to 1927 to arrange for the opening of this box. The subject is dealt with in *Randall Davidson*, by G. K. A. Bell, Vol. 2, pp. 1199-1201, and it is there mentioned that the box was opened on 11 July 1927 at the Church House, Westminster. One Bishop alone was present—the Bishop of Grantham, "with the help of a Professor, and of a sufficient audience". The contents were: ". . . A woman's night cap, a book called *The Surprises of Love: or An Adventure in Greenwich Park*, a lottery ticket of 1796, a calendar of the French Court in 1793, a medal of Augusta, Princess of Wales, of 1772, a pistol, a dice box, and a few coins."

"It was, truly, a queer revelation", comments the writer; and adds a footnote: "In view of this discomforture, episcopal aid is now (1935) being solicited for the opening of another box, alleged to be the true box."

As a matter of fact the Archbishop's Private Secretary, writing in reply to one of many requests in connection with Joanna Southcott's mysterious box, mentions that two or three people had written to say that there were rival boxes in different parts of England (this letter is dated 2 November 1922). Besides the twenty-four Bishops, it appeared that there were also required two thousand maidens in white—"a not very easy arrangement".

G. H. OFFICER

The Rectory, Wyalong, N.S.W.

REVIEWS

FAITH AND LOGIC

FAITH AND LOGIC: OXFORD ESSAYS IN PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY. Edited by BASIL MITCHELL. Allen and Unwin. 21s.

MYSTERY AND PHILOSOPHY. By MICHAEL B. FOSTER. S.C.M. 12s. 6d.

PLATO AND THE CHRISTIANS. By ADAM FOX. S.C.M. 21s.

Faith and Logic is a symposium by a small group of Oxford philosophers and theologians, who "met regularly in one another's rooms, to discuss whatever questions each felt like raising." One of the group, Michael B. Foster, who writes the last essay in the symposium, has also written the book *Mystery and Philosophy*. These two books represent a confrontation of theology with the philosophy of Logical Positivism and Linguistic Analysis. The Editor of the symposium quotes the saying of Professor Ryle: "In our half century philosophy and theology have not been on speaking terms." In these books the writers endeavour to bridge that gap, sometimes learning from contemporary philosophers, sometimes challenging such philosophers on their own ground.

We move into a very different world in the book *Plato and the Christians*. The Archdeacon of Westminster selects brief sayings from the Bible, and sets side by side with them passages from Plato in an excellent translation of his own. Just occasionally the Biblical references may seem a little remote; far more often they are very apt. As one example, there is the saying from St Luke, "When thou makest a feast, call the poor", and the passage from Plato, "In matters of personal entertainment there is merit in people not inviting their friends but beggars and those who are in want of a square meal." The two books which confront the philosophy of the modern world occasionally show a nostalgia for the wisdom of the ancient world, as when R. M. Hare ends his essay on Religion and Morals with a quotation from the *Republic*. At many points it is instructive to read these books side by side, and to notice their similarity of theme, and their similarity or difference of approach.

The issue with which modern philosophy confronts theology can be briefly summarized as follows. The advance of science has led to the wide extension of knowledge through the method of experiment. Michael Foster refers to Professor Reichenbach as "right in stressing experiment, not experience, as the important character in modern science". The earlier stage of Logical Positivism borrowed from the scientific method the canon of verifiability, and dismissed as nonsensical

all propositions which would not conform to this canon. It may be true that there are few Logical Positivists to-day "who regard the verification principle as the sole criterion of meaning"; yet this philosophy has left its challenge, and there is constant discussion in these books on the relation of theological statements to the canon of verifiability. The later stage of Linguistic Analysis follows the tradition of empiricism in the quest for clear and distinct ideas. It is still in close alliance with the scientific attitude; and as Michael Foster writes, "The goal towards which both scientist and philosopher are working is a state in which there will be no more mystery." Along both these lines there is a challenge to the whole metaphysical world of God, the soul, and immortality, which Plato takes for granted, and which in some form theology must of necessity preserve.

One line of defence is suggested by the title of Michael Foster's book, *Mystery and Philosophy*. I. M. Crombie summarizes the argument of his essay in the symposium: "The inquirer may learn from the paradoxical features of theological statements that, if they are about anything, they are about a mystery." Otto, in *The Idea of the Holy*, had taught the theologian to regard God as the *mysterium tremendum fascinans*. The Epistle to the Hebrews describes faith as a leap into the unknown in the phrase, "Abraham went out not knowing whither he went"; and Michael Foster quotes Roger Lloyd's description of prayer as "commitment to an undisclosed purpose". As Basil Mitchell points out in his essay "The Grace of God", "There is an analogy with the genius of a creative writer," who "may always surprise us with new departures, unpredictable, yet recognisably his." While these points are true, there is, however, danger in this attempt to defend theology against the impact of modern philosophy by identifying science with the known, and God with the unknown. If that were so, then the more the boundaries of knowledge are widened, the less place will be left for God. While there is a truth that God is ultimate mystery, nevertheless if we are to confront theology and science we need another, complementary approach, too little noticed in these books, which would discern the divine presence in the known, and not confine God to the unknown. The theologian would then join with the philosopher and man of science, in affirming with the Book of Wisdom: "In his hand are both we and our words; all understanding, and all acquaintance with divers crafts, for himself gave me unerring knowledge of the things that are."

The issues arise in another form, when we notice that the scientific approach deals with the world of objective experience, yet that there are realms of being with which both theology and ethics are concerned, which cannot thus be treated as objects. We must indeed admit that our behaviour is set in a space-time world, and that it may become a matter for observation by another person. J. R. Lucas therefore, in his essay on "The Soul", having referred to "the shocking thesis . . . known as Logical Behaviourism", immediately adds, "not all this thesis ought to shock," since "as St. Paul says, behaviour is the proper criterion of spiritual qualities". We must allow our moral behaviour to be judged by external

observation; to attempt to escape from this would involve us in a kind of ethical docetism. While this is true, it is not the whole truth. As I. M. Crombie points out in his essay, "Much of what goes on in us is describable from two standpoints: the standpoint of the observer . . . and the standpoint of the agent who is directly aware of himself." J. R. Lucas in his essay discusses the distinction we have learnt from Martin Buber between an I-Thou relation and an I-It relation. There are realities about another person, which we can never learn by treating them as an object of experiment but only when "we are able, on occasion, by the exercise of a certain sympathy to penetrate behind observable behaviour, and to put ourselves in another's shoes"; we may agree that "philosophers . . . have tended to neglect the phenomenon of intuitive insight".

We can now see why it is necessary both for theology and for ethics to challenge the canon of verifiability. The dilemma is posed by Basil Mitchell in his essay on "The Grace of God": "If it is a *fact* that the power of God enters into and guides the actions of men, then these divine operations must in principle be open to scientific tests . . . If statements about the divine activity are not even *in principle* amenable to scientific test, they are not to be regarded as statements of fact." At various points the writers meet this challenge by pointing out that the personal is unique and free; if we put personal behaviour on the scientific bench and ask it to conform to scientific test, we should in fact have deprived the object of that characteristic of freedom which is essential to the person as subject. Thus Austin Farrer in his essay on "Revelation" writes: "Nature is tested by masterful violence, but if God is to be known, it is by humble obedience, and by patient waiting for him." Michael Foster in his book touches on a point which deserves more thorough study in the present confrontation of theology and science, the meaning namely of the Biblical saying, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

While for these reasons the theologian must maintain faith in a world which is not open to the methods of scientific experiment, he should welcome from modern philosophy the challenge that he should at least try to make his meaning clear. For the task of evangelism, if for no other reason, the theologian must at least seek to be "on speaking terms" with the philosopher. Very probably in the process, while learning the language of the philosopher, the theologian will be led to express his own thoughts more clearly. As the editor of the symposium writes, it would be "a very complacent theologian who expected to learn nothing from a philosophical movement which has brought needed clarification into other disciplines". It may be a little more doubtful whether such clarification can only come by learning the new terminology of linguistic analysis. Possibly we must all learn to adopt terms like "modal" and "prescriptive" into our theological vocabulary. It is, however, a little refreshing to turn to *Plato and the Christians*, and to watch the methods of a philosopher who compels us to think more clearly, not by inventing new terms, but by making us use more accurately the terms we already use.

This comparison leads us to a final point, which emerges in these studies, as it does in much of the current discussion both in theology and in philosophy: Can the ultimate reality always be expressed in the clear and distinct ideas of rational discourse? Are there realities which are lost in such rational or logical exposition and which can only be conveyed through parable or myth? It would seem clear that in the realm of worship, in the realm of creative art, and in the realm of personal relationships and intuition, we do in fact convey meaning to one another by means of picture and myth. It is a curious paradox of the modern world, that while the philosophers plead for clear linguistic analysis and the theologians discuss demythologizing the Scriptures, a prominent psychologist like Eric Fromm writes of myth as the Forgotten Language, and says that "Symbolic language . . . is the one universal language the human race has ever developed". Possibly the next step in the confrontation of faith and logic will be a deeper insight into the logic of myth. Possibly when that stage comes, we may find that Plato and the Christians are alike in their use of myth, and alike just because they maintain the transcendent realities of God, the soul, and the world beyond death.

GEOFFREY ALLEN

KIERKEGAARD ON TRUTH

SUBJECTIVITY AND PARADOX. By J. HEYWOOD THOMAS. Blackwell. 18s.

IT IS A brilliant book of only 176 pages that Mr Thomas has written. He approaches S. Kierkegaard from the philosophical angle, and takes the two central themes of Subjectivity and Paradox (round which most of S. K's teaching revolves) and deals with them only. His knowledge, as it seems, of Danish, Swedish, German, French, and perhaps other languages too, gives him a wide range of reading to bring to bear on his thinking, and the result is very rich fare indeed. I am not sure that I agree with M. Pierre Mesnard's assessment of S.K's *Concept of Irony*, which Mr Thomas accepts; and Mr Thomas apparently goes wrong (page 8) in translating P. M. Moller's word *Affektation* by "feeling". (The treatise of P.M.M. which Mr Thomas refers to is literally about affectation.) There are other such slips, too. In explaining S.K's difficult *Diapsalm* about *tautology*, in which, as Mr Thomas rightly says, "the brilliance of the language may hide a certain looseness in the reasoning", I think Mr Thomas misses the important and ironic point that the aesthetic life which the *Diapsalmata* portray, is in its way as much a "glittering tautology" as S.K. says Hegel's thought is.

However these are small matters. The book begins with a valuable glance at Hegel's earlier and less known religious treatises, before

glancing at the later and better known ones. Like Lessing in *Nathan*, Hegel is at first enamoured of "folk religion", the religion of each "folk" being equally good. Then he passes to viewing the Life of Jesus as the basis of a quasi-Kantian Universal ethics. Then he finds the woeful germs of institutional religion in the teaching of Jesus himself, and finally comes to his well-known position that God is not a person but is *quâ* Spirit immanent in man and indeed in all creation. Every man is a God/Man, and spirit answers to Spirit in a forward movement made by "mediation" towards the same goal as religion. Indeed religion and philosophy are the same in content but differ in form.

Right-wing Hegelians like Marheincke and Daub tried to build up a speculative theology which sought to reconcile orthodox theology with Hegelian thought. Left-wing, more radical Hegelians, like Strauss and Feuerbach, threw over orthodox teaching altogether, and spoke of Christian narratives as mere "myths".

Hegel and Hegelianism were all *à la mode* in S.K's day. J. L. Heiberg and H. L. Martensen were its exponents in Denmark. The former accepted the thesis that philosophy and religion were the same in content; the latter tried to unite faith and knowledge by means of a mystical approach. (Martensen was interested in Eckhardt and Boehme.) Intuition was the basis of Christianity, and the theologian's task is explicative, trying to understand the "given" intuition in relation to Christian dogma.

Mr Thomas' account of all this is good. When he passes to investigate the sources of S.K's doctrine of Subjectivity he is good too; though we must beware of whittling away S.K's originality by saying it comes from somewhere else. Is that "somewhere" Luther, Baeder, Schelling, Lessing, Hamann, the mystics such as Eckhardt, Görres and Boehme, the Church Fathers—all of whom S.K. knew, for many of their books stood on his shelves and are freely referred to in the *Papirer*? Whatever the answer be (and Mr Thomas presents the pros and cons admirably), certain it is that S.K. vigorously opposed the Hegelian objectivization of knowledge (and still more of religion). His vigorous assertion that *Subjectivity is truth* summarizes his position. It is good to find Mr Thomas standing against the error of supposing that S.K. is a *mere* subjectivist or *mere* individualist. Eternal Truth for him was the objective truth of Christianity as presented both in the New Testament and (as Geismar says) in Chalcedonian theology. S.K's passionate desire was to insist on the necessity of personal appropriation of this truth. It is truth *for me*, or no truth at all in the deeper sense. He brings the person into philosophy, including the philosopher himself. He saw no use in a philosophy divorced from life; still less in a God who is not personal. The relationship of the individual to Truth is ultimately one of faith, for Truth bears upon life. And faith cannot be proved; it is no mere verifiable hypothesis. It is a risk made in passion. It is a Leap. Whether S.K. got the idea of the Leap from Hegel (as Bohlin asserts and Thomas rightly denies) or Kant, or Schelling, or Trendelenburg, or even Aristotle—what matter? Lessing is the person S.K. names, and Jacobi. It

is a picture-term denoting discontinuity. It brings in the "I". All Truth related to life, as opposed to the "disinterested" truth of, say, pure mathematics and other sciences, and must be apprehended by *me*. Christianity especially says to *me*, What is your relationship to that Eternal Truth which is not to be found unfolded Hegelian-wise in world-history, but revealed in sacred history, notably in the Paradox—the Absolute Paradox—of the God/Man? It was a great discovery, help, and relief to S.K. to find that Hamann was quite undisturbed by Hume's ridiculing of Christianity. "Hume unwittingly speaks truth", said Hamann. No doubt faith is an offence to Reason; but the mistake is to suppose that Reason can solve the riddle of existence. Only faith can do that, says S.K., faith in an objective uncertainty held fast so firmly that the holding is certainty itself.

Does anybody say that since Hegel and Hegelianism do not trouble people to-day, therefore S.K. is outdated? (The statement itself is not quite true, for there is, anyway in America, a revival of the study of Hegel, and both there and in England new translations are appearing.) The answer is that the neo-Hegelian monistic thinkers and Rationalists are still with us. Faith has at least as good a right to human attention as epistemology and natural science. But faith is not proof; neither legal, scientific, nor deductive proof.

Again, does anybody say that Schleiermacher is outdated? (Dr Selbie, anyway, did not think so.) But we still have the empiricists with us. Nobody can object to a man saying, "This is my experience"; indeed as S.K. says, personal witness is the best medium to express Christianity to others. But truth does not depend on mere feeling or experience.

Are theologians still sometimes anxious somehow to reconcile knowledge with faith, as though faith were come at *uno tenore* with knowledge? It cannot be done. Are theologians afraid of the modern linguistic-analysis philosophy? No need to fear, says Mr Thomas. The clue to the meaning of religion does not lie in the linguistic or even the logical-positivist way. For *Subjectivity is truth*, and the greatness of S.K. is precisely that he has emphasized and demonstrated this so bravely and so thoroughly.

T. H. Croxall

PHILOSOPHIC THOUGHT

British Philosophy in the Mid-Century: A Cambridge Symposium. Edited by C. A. Mace. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

The essays published in this volume had their origin in a course of lectures organized by the British Council at Peterhouse, Cambridge, in the summer of 1953. This course, the first of its kind, was attended by professors, lecturers, and teachers of philosophy from such countries as

France, Belgium, Italy, Austria, China, and the United States. The lecturers were in the main Cambridge philosophers, but contributions were invited from representatives of Bristol, London, and Oxford. It was at first intended that the lectures should be published as delivered, but many lecturers wished to expand or redraft their papers. In the case of some lectures the changes incorporated in the published versions were extensive.

Inevitably in a volume of this kind the essays differ considerably both in quality and in form; but even in the case of the more obviously unsatisfactory pieces like Dr H. Bondi's ten pages on "Some Philosophical Problems of Cosmology", the reader will find something to reward him. To some extent a review of a book like this must take the shape of an inventory. Thus at the outset Professor Broad offers us fifty-odd pages on the development of philosophy in Cambridge in the last fifty years, a characteristically informative, urbane, and polished performance. He is followed by Dr A. C. Ewing who writes on recent developments on British ethical thought, offering a clear account of the main tendencies and preoccupations of British moral philosophers up to and including W. D. Ross's *Foundations of Ethics* (1939); Ewing then goes on to evaluate, from his own point of view, some of the work done in these fields by writers like Ayer, Stevenson, and Hare, concluding his essay with a personally characteristic use of a suggestion made to him by Professor John Wisdom concerning a possible compromise between the methods and emphases of these last-named writers and those of more traditionally minded workers in the field. Dr Mace, the Editor, offers a concentrated and witty survey of some trends in the philosophy of mind, including some sharp comment on the limits of behaviourism; both Dr Mace and Professor Körner, who contributes a version of his inaugural lecture on some types of philosophical thinking, are prepared to take very seriously the claims of something which they call "phenomonology", and the reader who follows his way consecutively through the book is well prepared by the time he comes to Professor G. E. Moore's short essay on visual-sense-data, to take the notion of sense-datum with a seriousness that some recent British writers have notably failed to show in their attitude towards it!

One could continue this inventory indefinitely, and certainly mention must be made of the fact that Dr Theodore Redpath's concluding essay is devoted to some problems of modern aesthetics: the inclusion of an essay on such a topic is clearly indicative of the state of British philosophy to-day, and the growing revival of interest in aesthetic theory. Some may judge it equally significant that there is no paper of any sort dealing with the methods and problems of political philosophy.

Three essays, however, deserve the very highest commendation, and are in their different ways essential reading for anyone interested in the state of philosophy to-day. Professor Gilbert Ryle, in his paper on the theory of meaning, offers a brilliant and deeply illuminating historical survey of the development of modern philosophical analysis. This paper, within the limits its author has set himself, is a really first-rate essay in

the history of philosophy, and affords a clear answer to many of the questions generally asked concerning the pedigree of the so-called analytic method and its development. Dr Karl Popper in his "personal report" on the philosophy of science, sets out with commanding vigour and insight his well-known views on scientific method and the crucial rôle played in it by falsification as distinct from confirmation; he includes in his paper a fascinating autobiographical fragment.

Miss Margaret Masterman's long paper on metaphysical language is the most original, as it is certainly the most difficult, in the volume. It embodies a contribution to a discussion, to which incidentally Dr Körner also contributes in his account of "metaphysical directives" in his paper, that is increasingly taking a central place in the concerns of British philosophers, namely the evaluation of the precise sense and force of metaphysical theory. The quick dismissal of metaphysics as nonsense has given place to a quite different attitude; there is deep perplexity concerning the status and validity of the various enterprises comprised together under the rubric "metaphysics"; but there is a common readiness to recognize that here we have to do with styles of thought and language of profound human significance, even if also of elusive and deeply questionable logical character. In her paper Miss Masterman says much on these topics that is bold and original, even if frequently obscure; her essay calls for examination of a kind that it can hardly receive in a review that must largely confine itself to indicating the contents of the whole book. But its presence in the volume alone makes the work well worth obtaining.

To these three essays one might well add Professor Ayer's beautifully clear examination of the problems of perception; but since that essay was written, he has embodied a fuller account of what it contains in his recent book, *The Problem of Knowledge*. To illustrate, however, the general excellence and vigour of the writing in the whole volume, one could hardly do better than quote the concluding sentences of Professor Braithwaite's paper on probability and induction (he is discussing the relations of induction to deduction):

> Our only sin of omission is to have failed to reduce induction to deduction. But, if this is a sin, it derives indeed from the original sin of a Prometheus who dared to engage upon empirical science instead of confining himself to the pure mathematics beloved of the Gods—and the philosophers (p. 151).

D. M. Mackinnon

THE NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE

Words and Images: A Study in Theological Discourse. By E. L. Mascall. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

One feels curiously hesitant about Dr Mascall's book. It is concerned with a very important subject, and it is written by a man who carries

much of the equipment necessary to make an important contribution to its elucidation. He is a theologian of acknowledged reputation, and he has several philosophical works to his credit. He has also taken part in contemporary discussions of the issues with which he is dealing, in Oxford and elsewhere, and commands on the whole an enviable familiarity with the literature, both in books and periodicals, which is relevant to his chosen subject. Thus he can discuss matters like the so-called verification principle, Professor R. B. Braithwaite's recent essay in theism without God, Dr Farrer's doctrine of the image and its rôle in the mediation of divine truth in the human mind, with a certain ease and mastery. Further he can draw with great effect on relatively little-known writings bearing on his problems like G. K. Chesterton's essay on G. F. Watts and the passages in Professor C. S. Lewis' work on *Miracles* in which its author draws on the very interesting speculations about language of Mr Owen Barfield.

Moreover one is continually reminded that Dr Mascall has, in one sense, the root of the matter in him; he is deeply aware of the extent to which much work in the theory of knowledge, belonging to the hey-day of logical positivism and continuing to this present, is coloured by a conception of knowledge which, to borrow the language of Dr Josef Pieper, whom he quotes on pp. 63 f. of his book, holds that activity to be "the opposite of receptive and contemplative"; to be "realised in the act of comparing, examining, relating, distinguishing, abstracting, deducing, demonstrating—all of which are forms of active intellectual effort. . . ." Dr Mascall is certainly right in supposing metaphysicians to have taken for granted the possibility of a very different sort of knowledge, one in which, to speak metaphorically, our awareness is shaped, formed, attuned to the way things are, in which (to use the old tag) *mens quodammodo fit omnia*; he is also certainly right to emphasize how deeply pervasive of the whole modern controversy with which he is concerned is this opposition between two conceptions of human knowledge. No one has succeeded in bringing this point out better than the late Professor Moritz Schlick in a major early work, *Allgemeine Erkenntnislehre*. It may well be that Dr Mascall would have achieved much more, if he had restricted his canvas and confined himself to a really serious attempt to face Schlick's sustained and searching criticisms of the kind of knowledge which Mascall clearly believes to be possible, and of which he offers us (often by way of quotation, e.g., from G. K. Chesterton) a tantalizing outline. It may seem unfair criticism to suggest that an author would have been better advised to do something other than he actually did; but it seems clear that part of the book's failure derives from the diffusion of its reference (even in part from a certain hastiness of composition); and therefore a reviewer is perhaps justified in suggesting how the book's central insight could have been developed and possibly rendered more secure.

Other faults must, however, be noticed. Dr Mascall does not, unhappily, inspire confidence as an historian of philosophy. Thus Berkeley's God is not simply a universal sentience (p. 32). It is grossly

to misrepresent Kant's theory of knowledge to speak of him as making "a desperate attempt to restore the trans-sensory substance, but in vain" (p. 33). One need not accept Kant's theory of knowledge to see that for him the notion of substance as a category of the discursive understanding has a quite determinate function in experience. It is simply not true, as Dr Mascall seems to suggest, that Kant tried to rehabilitate something akin to Locke's dualism. It is a pity that Dr Mascall nowhere considers Kant's opposition between the intuitive and the discursive, between the archetypal and ectypal, understandings, a distinction quite fundamental to Kant's system and highly relevant incidentally to Dr Mascall's concerns. In drawing this distinction towards the end of the *Critique of Judgment*, Kant comes nearer than anywhere else in his writings to appreciating the inwardness of the method of analogy; a point to which considerable weight was given in the deeply suggestive writings of one of the most brilliant of all recent Thomist philosophers, the late Père Rousselot. His unfortunate lack of detailed knowledge of the history of modern philosophy prevents Dr Mascall from really exploring the extent to which, working from within the experience of knowledge as such, one can begin to conceive and to grasp for what it is, that opposition between the relative and the absolute, between the mediate and the immediate, between the discursive and the intuitive, which sometimes he seems to be trying to articulate. Certainly Kant compels his readers to ask themselves not how human knowledge can acquire a sort of immediacy which seems denied to it, but rather to take seriously the possibility that the kind of immediacy of which they dream remains the prerogative of the absolute or divine consciousness, and can never, in the nature of things, be enjoyed as an actual possession by finite individuals. It might be remarked in conclusion that Kant's discussion of these matters has a very real bearing on Schlick's problem, for all that philosopher's indebtedness to Kant's work in his statement of his own position against, e.g., that of Max Scheler.

Again, although in his concluding chapters Dr Mascall certainly says some very interesting things concerning Dr Farrer's doctrine of the image, there is a curious half-heartedness in his treatment of these matters. Thus the reader is never allowed even to know that Dr L. S. Thornton in his great work, *The Form of the Servant*, has really tried, drawing brilliantly on Irenaeus and on Leibniz to help him, to offer what one might call an ontological foundation of typological exegesis. Whereas Farrer, in his writings on the scriptures, remains all the time preoccupied by something very like the "association of ideas" in the consciousness of the inspired writers, Thornton digs his roots deep in what is, and shows himself, for all his sensitivity to the variety and complexity of Biblical symbolism, realist in the beginning and in the end. It is paradoxical, but true, that Farrer, who in metaphysics is a convinced realist, in his writings on the scriptures seems to surrender himself to a kind of ballet-dance of ideas, to a process curiously akin to that which the old fashioned associationist psychology loved to trace. There is a schism between his metaphysics and his often brilliant and

important work on the scriptures. Of this, as pp. 116 ff. of his book suggest, Dr Mascall seems to be aware; but he turns aside, in a way in which Thornton most certainly does not, from facing the problem of this gulf, which is part at least of the problem of theology, of faith seeking understanding.

These may seem harsh criticisms; but the importance of the subject of the book and Dr Mascall's real courage in writing it, compel the reviewer to pay it the compliment of taking it as seriously as it is intended. It would certainly serve admirably the purposes of any university teacher concerned to conduct a seminar in the matters with which it deals.

D. M. MACKINNON

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

JUSTICE. By JOSEF PIEPER. Faber. 12s. 6d.

EVEN those who cannot call themselves in the strict sense Thomists, must acknowledge that in Thomism at its best there are displayed the qualities of a profound traditional wisdom. Its temper is aristocratic in its distinction and contemplative detachment; yet it is concerned with what is, and its peculiar clarity will not allow us ever to dismiss it as esoteric. Its masters (and Dr Josef Pieper is among them) show command of a culture which is neither narrowly scholastic nor Aristotelian, but classical in a true sense. To read this little book on justice is further to be reminded, now in one way now in another, that this tradition is a living thing, enabling those who live by its resources to pass pointed and illuminating comment on the contemporary scene.

Dr Pieper's book is short; but the reader will find in it much that is valuable relating to the circumference as well as to the centre of Dr Pieper's chosen theme. Thus, scattered through its pages lie references to the vexed question of the extent to which justice in his dealings with his creatures can properly be attributed or denied to God. The whole tangled metaphysical and theological question of the validity of our fundamental ethical predicates when predicated of God is raised, almost in passing, and the power (and also the limitations) of the Thomist "method of analogy" in dealing with this question deftly indicated. Moreover the last chapter contains, again almost by the way, some interesting suggestions on the Thomist understanding of religion as such.

But Dr Pieper's central theme is the cardinal virtue of justice, both in itself and in its relations to, and differences from, the other cardinal virtues. In his analysis of justice, understood by reference to the ancient formula, *suum cuique tradere*, and differentiated in its three basic forms

or moments, mutually complementary one with another, of legal, commutative, and distributive justice, he displays a beautiful precision and a remarkable knowledge of the literature of his theme. Thus, he will illuminate his argument by a sudden reference to Kant as well as to Cicero, to Ambrose as well as to Plotinus. From Ambrose indeed he quotes the sentence, "Fortitude without justice is a source (*iniquitatis materia*) of evil" (p. 43), in the course of a very pointed discussion of the relation of justice to fortitude, which culminates in a reference to a view developed at greater length in Dr Pieper's other work, *The End of Time*, viz. that "we ought to be prepared to find that the most powerful embodiment of evil in human history, the Antichrist, might well appear in the guise of a great ascetic". We are all of us familiar these days with new forms of the romantic cult of the heroic; they are certainly manifested in some styles of existentialist thinking and writing. It is not the least practical value of Dr Pieper's work that, in his cool and judicious analysis of the roots and nature of justice and its relation to the other cardinal virtues, he reminds us how clear are the warnings of traditional moral philosophy against the cultivation of endurance as an end in itself in isolation from human life as a whole.

It is certainly a traditional wisdom that Dr Pieper is expounding; and although his exposition is detached, it is never remote from what he would judge to be the errors of this present age. For instance, in his account of the way in which the basic forms of justice must be esteemed complementary one to another, he is obviously deeply aware of, e.g., the way in which in Stalinism all human issues are crudely and brutally politicized in order thereby the more effectively to serve the cause of the party's assault on the citadels of power. His book will be very valuable to those who, like the present reviewer, are professionally engaged in the teaching of moral philosophy, and who need continually to be reminded of the actual content of those traditional ideas concerning virtues, actions, and the rest, with whose criticism in the modern period their subject, as they must teach it, is largely concerned. It is very easy to lose sight of what those fundamental ideas were which a writer like John Stuart Mill was now trying to criticize, now trying to evaluate, now even trying in some sense in spite of himself to accept. Dr Pieper's book can help us much here. But its author's "presence" to the world around him demands that we do not look on it simply as a source of information, but also pay serious attention to the validity of what he says, e.g., in his chapter on the justice of government (pp. 65 ff.).

In this chapter we have an attempted rehabilitation of such neglected concepts of political theory as the *common good* and authority, in their relations one with another. It is a curiously searching chapter, and there is no doubt whatsoever that in his emphasis on the principle of authority Dr Pieper pin-points a very crucial contemporary issue. What is the proper authority of governments in their relation to the governed? It is Dr Pieper's view that the authority of government as such in relation to controversial issues of distributive justice resides in the over-all concern of men in positions of legislative, executive, and

administrative responsibility with the *common good*. Governments must govern in the sense of effectively seeking that good, or abdicate. Dr Pieper has some wise words to say on the services that may be fulfilled by democratic political institutions in enabling governments more effectively to fulfil this task; but he is also inevitably alive to the latent, even overt, tension which may sometimes, even often, manifest itself between the principle of authority and the democratic insistence that power shall be held accountable to those in whose name it is exercised. It might well be said that the most important theorists of the modern democratic state, from Rousseau to A. D. Lindsay, have clearly recognized in one way or another this tension and the dangers to which it may lead. Dr Pieper may *sometimes* show himself too oblivious of the extent to which governments, and ruling classes generally, may destroy their authority by pursuing less a common good than a sectional interest. It is here indeed that democratic institutions can prove themselves the safeguard and not the enemy of authority. A passage referring to Plato's *Laws* on page 96 shows that Dr Pieper is well aware of this himself. But the general bias of his mind, even though he is always drawing on the resources of his culture to correct himself, is in the direction of a deep regret that in the modern age men have lost sight, at once rulers and ruled, of the *mystery* (to borrow M. Gabriel Marcel's useful word) of authority whither in the political or the moral order.

One's personal prejudices are inevitably deeply engaged here; but it is for this reason that those who, like the present reviewer, accept what they understand to be the principles of the modern democratic state, must acknowledge how much they have to learn from writers who, like Dr Pieper, remind them in a way at once exact and relevant, of easily neglected aspects of that moral tradition in which the democratic idea itself was born and nourished. There is in this book a certain quality of distinction, manifested alike in its exegesis of such relatively obscure Thomist notions as *restitutio*, and in its comments on the contemporary scene, which gives it a value to the student of moral and political philosophy far in excess of its length.

D. M. Mackinnon

INTERPRETING THE BIBLE

Biblical Interpretation. By E. C. Blackman. Independent Press. 12s. 6d.

In spite of a plentiful use of exclamation marks that makes some pages look like a schoolgirl's letter, and in spite of its hestitation between the spellings Jowitt and Jowett, this is a work of genuine scholarship and sound learning. It is genuine in that it shows first-hand acquaintance with the more important literature of the subject. It is sound in that it steers a safe course between the vagaries of criticism

and the fanaticism of fundamentalism.

It explains itself as a consideration of the old difficulties and the new opportunities. Certainly it is not content merely to review theories that have been held and abandoned, but it makes a serious attempt to assist the present-day preacher and the devout reader to find a satisfactory method of reading and interpreting the Bible for themselves. For the most part we find ourselves in cordial agreement with the essentially commonsense view of the author. We wonder, however, whether he is not occasionally betrayed by enthusiasm into extravagance. For instance, "Christ is to be found only in and through the Bible." Is he? We would guarantee that not one person in a hundred so finds him. For our own part we found him first at our mother's knee and we were later made more fully acquainted with him through the teaching of pastors and masters. True, the Bible was always there in the background and presently we were able to go to it for ourselves, but we first learnt Christ from members of the Christian family, not from any book, however sacred; and we should hazard the guess that it is almost always so. Most of us surely gain our earliest knowledge of Christ through the living voice of believers. After all is that not what the Church is for? "The Church to teach and the Bible to prove", is still an unshaken aphorism.

Granted this fundamental rule, all that the book says about the various methods of interpretation will be found most helpful. The author regards the quest for the historical Jesus as salutary and indeed necessary, but reminds us that the Jesus of history *is* the Christ of faith. This Christ whom we can thus find in the Bible "remains in a unique sense the Revealer of the saving purpose of God". "Christ was not the first Christian but the Founder of Christianity." Consequently the authority of the Bible in its own sphere stands alone. Of rival methods of interpretation he sees a limited case for allegory and typology, regarding allegory as concerned with exegesis of a *text* while typology is concerned with the significance of *events*. As for incorporating into our inquiry the results of archaeology and critical philology, he finely says that we have so to understand what became divine direction in the case of the ancient Hebrews that it may become divine guidance for us; "to transpose the Word of God addressed to their circumstances so that it may be equally a Word of God to ours".

W.W.

THE TEMPLE

THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM. (Studies in Biblical Archaeology, No. 5.) By ANDRE PARROT. S.C.M. 9s. 6d.

IT IS unfortunately true that for many people the whole value and purpose of the Old Testament is limited to the ethical teaching of the

prophets. It is however, in no sense a belittling or denigration of that teaching to say that it is only a part, if the most important part, of a much larger whole; namely the history of the chosen people, their call, their mission, their temptations, and their failure. Perhaps the greatest benefit secured by the work of the archaeologists is that their discoveries and conclusions bring to our minds the children of Israel as a people with a history and culture of their own and a place, all the more remarkable spiritually because so small, among the nations of the ancient world.

There was one place, one building, which from the time of the unification of the tribes became above all others identified with the nation. This was the Temple built by Solomon on the threshing floor of Ornan which had been purchased by his father David. It was the earthly dwelling place of God himself; his guarantee of his presence and his protection to Israel. It became the epitome of the nation to every devout Jew wherever he lived, the object of his pilgrimages and his alms. To this day that site is still a place of pilgrimage, though now to the Moslem rather than to the Jew, and it is the one place reverenced by the three great monotheistic religions of the world.

A book, then, which sets out to describe the buildings which have stood on that spot since David's time cannot but be full of interest, and a book which interprets plainly the rather bewildering measurements and descriptions of 1 Kings is of obvious usefulness. The first and longest chapter of the book gives a description of Solomon's Temple, both the building itself with its three rooms each of which had its own purpose, and also the decorations and furnishings, such as the two pillars, the bronze altar, and the bronze sea. There follows a description of Ezekiel's Temple, a building which never existed other than in the mind of its originator, but which was to have a great influence on the second Temple built after the return from exile. Little is known of this Temple, so that little can be said about it. Probably architecturally it was rather poor and its furnishings not of the best, but during its period the Law was established and the Temple, as an institution, reached the height of its power and influence both in Palestine and, through the Jews of the Dispersion, throughout the ancient world. This is not mentioned by Professor Parrot, but it is surely necessary to complete the story, because a direct consequence of it was Herod's determination to replace the rather shabby and damaged Temple by his own magnificent edifice. A further chapter provides a good description of this third Temple, showing both the magnitude of Herod's achievement and the splendour of the building. This chapter will be very useful to those who wish to get a clear idea of the Temple which was the background to so much of our Lord's teaching.

The book is well rounded off by an account of the founding, on the ruined Temple area in the seventh century A.D., of the Moslem shrine which stands there to this day. There is a useful bibliography for any who may wish to pursue the subject further, and throughout the book the reader is helped to follow the text by diagrams and illustrations.

There are several good photographs of the Temple area as it is to-day, but the first photograph, of an architect's model of Herod's Temple, seems rather pointless, since we are told later in the text that all such models should be treated with extreme caution. Professor Parrot always refers to Ornan the Jebusite. He might have found a place in his notes to tell us that Ornan is the name used in Chronicles; Samuel always uses Araunah. These are, however, minor criticisms of a book which will make available to the ordinary reader much information which could not easily be found elsewhere.

J. ROBINSON

THE HOLY PLACES

GOLGOTHA AND THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE. (Studies in Biblical Archaeology, No. 6.) By ANDRE PARROT. S.C.M. 10s. 6d.

THE pilgrim arriving in the Holy City for the first time has as his main purpose and his chief desire to "see the place where the Lord lay". And so he makes his way to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. What he finds there baffles and bewilders him. Can this indeed be "the place"? Instinctively he says, no: and many a one has turned away from the Church and the traditional site of the Sepulchre to seek something more devotionally satisfying and more in accordance with the Biblical description of Golgotha, Calvary, and the Tomb of Christ. In modern times many have found what they wanted, and so have been convinced that they have found the real thing, at the "Garden Tomb", which lies outside the existing city walls, on the Nablus road, not far from the Damascus gate of the city.

It is the walls that form the first and greatest stumbling-block to the pilgrim. For the traditional site, contained to-day within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, is well within the present walls, and not only so, but hemmed in by houses, towers, and minarets of all kinds.

All who hope one day to make the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and many who have done so and perhaps come away feeling none too sure of the authenticity of the traditional site of the Sepulchre—"the place where the Lord lay"—as well as the general reader, interested and ready to give some thought to the subject, can be profoundly grateful to Professor Parrot for the book which he has written as a result of his own extensive research and study. It is just the book we have wanted. It is easy to read and follow, and yet it discusses the subject in considerable detail. It contains excellent photographs and drawings which add considerably to the enjoyment of reading the book.

Naturally, Professor Parrot deals first with the question of the walls, and shows from archaeological and literary evidence that the site of the

present Church of the Holy Sepulchre was indubitably outside the city walls as they were in our Lord's time. With this initial stumbling-block removed, he proceeds to tell the story of the site following the destruction of Jerusalem in the year A.D. 70, and of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The story is clearly and concisely told, and the author provides many references to the authorities, for the benefit of those who may care to undertake more detailed study. His conclusion is that, while he is not prepared to go so far as to say that the matter is closed, and that it is *absolutely certain* that the Sepulchre of Jesus lies beneath the edicule in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, yet he does believe it to be established that the overwhelming probability is that it is there and nowhere else, in this Jerusalem which has undergone such radical changes since Pilate's day. As for any other suggested site, such as the "Gordon Calvary" and the "Garden Tomb" associated with it, it must be eliminated without the slightest hesitation. Archaeology condemns it out of hand.

A. J. G. HAWES

THE GOSPEL CHALLENGED

JESUS IN ROME. By ROBERT GRAVES and JOSHUA PODRO. Cassell. 8s. 6d

THE authors of this slim volume seem apprehensive that it may be as roughly handled as its predecessor, *The Nazarene Gospel Restored*, 1954, to which it forms an epilogue. They find space in their first chapter to recall the chastening of several unhappy reviewers of their earlier undertaking, who were carried away, it seems, by the noble infirmity of indignation. One sympathizes with everybody concerned; but especially with Mr Graves and Mr Podro, who have brought to their self-imposed task much honest pain and enormous ingenuity. We have all been warned.

Here is a theory about the true origins of the (Christian) gospel and the wild falsifications entailed by the "official" *kerugma* of the Scriptures and the Church. The publisher's blurb tells us accurately what that theory is. Jesus was ineffectively crucified, he recovered from the ordeal—with astonishing speed; for he visited the disciples on the evening of the third day—and continued to live on earth to a considerable age. He (physically) encountered St Paul on the Damascus road, visited Rome in order to fulfil part of the Messianic rôle, and possibly spent the last years of his life in India, visiting the Jews of the Dispersion in the Far East, eventually being buried, by St Thomas perhaps, in the neighbourhood of Srinagar.

The Indian episode, dealt with in the fifth and last chapter, does not however form part of the main thesis. It is included because it is "the

only extant [Moslem] legend with any historical plausibility that brings the post-Crucifixion story of Jesus to a simple and natural end". How plausible we think it may depend chiefly on the plausibility of the main thesis itself.

The crux is contained in the first chapter, where it is asserted that Jesus physically survived crucifixion. "He seems to have survived the ordeal by an extraordinary chain of circumstances. (See N.G.R.CXIV.)" (p. 12).

The argument, and the evidence adduced, are merely summarized: and one must be excused for thinking them astonishingly suppostitious. The centurion diagnosed "premature death" (?); the sword (spear) failed to pierce the lungs: the body was kept warm by the sultriness of the weather and properties of the ointment on the shroud. Having kept Jesus alive, the authors experience some difficulty in getting him safely out of the tomb. "How he escaped from the tomb where he had been laid for safe-keeping until the Feast had ended, remains problematical, since it could be opened only from the outside and by the exercise of great strength" (p. 12). In spite of this problem the thesis might be maintained if it could be convincingly shown, for example, that any one of the later clues could be pinned down, proved to be more than a shadowy and intangible wraith; that the human Jesus appeared to Paul on the Damascus road; or that St Ignatius—quoted as saying that "he is in the flesh ever since his resurrection"—really meant that Jesus had not died under crucifixion; or that the records used by Suetonius in referring to the "instigator Chrestus" (*impulsore Chresto*) were not in origin rumours confusing the message of a militant and unpopular sect with the physical presence of its founder. But at no point does the ambiguity fade, the phantom solidify: and one wonders how the authors can hope to carry with them any fair-minded reader not sharing their own firm belief, from the start, in the truth of the cause.

In their view of St Paul's character and rôle they identify themselves with other critics of the "canonical picture" who have sought to denigrate the apostle. Thus: "In view of Saul's many conspicuous failures to tell the truth, no credence need be paid to his declaration that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews." Well, all men are liars, sometimes; but the statement remains a gross *non sequitur*. Could St Paul have been this ruthless city slicker, this opportunist, and still have written those epistles? Apparently so.

The reader will judge for himself what is the cumulative value of the evidence and quality of the argument. Certainly, hints and tatters of evidence may suddenly lead to substantiated truth: and for that reason alone they should be relentlessly pursued in every direction. Messrs Graves and Podro for the most part take scrupulous care to express themselves in a conditional and speculative idiom; yet just because they already passionately believe what they wish to demonstrate—and the *defensor fidei* is in a similar predicament—they sometimes pull a very fast one indeed! Thus: "If we may believe Paul's pleadings before Festus . . . Jesus was still walking the earth in A.D. 60" (a jaunty translation

of the Greek of Acts 25. 19: "whom Paul declared to be alive").

What drives informed and ingenuous men to lengths of ingenuity? Chiefly, it seems, the absence of a reasonable alternative. The gospel cannot be true. We Christians are dishonest or naïve. Supernatural events are *a priori* impossible, and orthodox belief is blindly opposed to the findings of modern science. (Now it is not geology or anthropology but, of course, nuclear physics, which proves that if Jesus had dematerialized at the Ascension, there would have been a shocking explosion!) The inquisitive can read all about it on page 5. But it seems a pity that in spite of all the modern means of communication between intelligent beings, such Pseudodoxia Epidemica should continue to bedevil us.

H. H. Hoskins

FAMILY HISTORY

Five Northamptonshire Families (1540-1640). By Mary E. Finch. Northamptonshire Record Society. 30s.

With the publication of Dr Mary Finch's thesis on "The Wealth of Five Northamptonshire Families 1540-1640", the Northamptonshire Record Society has added yet another volume to its fine series.

The "families" which the writer has selected for her purpose are the Ishams of Lamport, the Spencers of Althorp, the Treshams of Rushton, the Fitzwilliams of Milton, and the Brudenells of Deene. She is concerned to account for the changes in the fortunes of these families—the ascendancy of four and the decline of one—during the century between the Dissolution of the Monasteries and the outbreak of the Civil War. If the main sources of wealth were sheep-farming, estate management, and, in one case, court patronage, personal character could often be the deciding factor. So, the prudence and industry of an Isham, standing in marked contrast to the recklessness and folly of a Tresham, explains much, if not all, in the story of subsequent success or failure.

The element of personal choice also played its part. Thus, while on the death of Sir William in 1534, the Fitzwilliam family turned its back on London town and mercantile gains, it was but seven years later that John Isham, apprentice, and afterwards Mercer and Merchant Adventurer, arrived in that same city, seeking his fortune. Isham is indeed the typically romantic hero: the lad who came to London with no money in his pockets, and who, some five-and-twenty years later, as Warden of his Company, was able to provide so sumptuous a banquet that his fellow-Mercers could only gaze in astonishment at the thirty-three fat bucks lying in a gallery of his house in preparation for the feast, and declare that never before had a warden received so many.

It goes without saying that, in the period of history with which this volume deals, none of the families could be without ecclesiastical connection—a Fitzwilliam for example, rebuilt the church of St Andrew Undershaft in London. These interests were, however, largely of a selfish kind, such as the acquisition of ecclesiastical impropriations, and investment in church property. Sir John Isham was even accused of having tried to extinguish the knowledge of the parsonage of Lamport, "calling the parsonage house (whereupon he has expended money) the Hall or manor house"! It is in the nature of a tragedy that the one family, the Treshams, which took a definite stand in the matter of its religious convictions, even to the extent of paying recusancy fines amounting to more than £7,700, should also have been the one family to become extinct.

Footnotes, appendixes, and tables, as well as family portraits and pedigrees, enhance the value of Dr Finch's most thorough and detailed piece of research, to which Professor H. J. Habakkuk has contributed a preface.

GORDON HUELIN

II NICAEA

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE SEVENTH COUNCIL. C. B. MOSS. Faith Press. 5s.

DR MOSS wants the Church of England to assist reunion with the Orthodox by accepting—in some sense—the Seventh Council, that is, II Nicaea, A.D. 787, which dealt with iconoclasm. Though his booklet cannot provide all the material or arguments on which decision should be based, it is well suited to arouse discussion. What he has to say falls, broadly speaking, into two parts, the story of the council and its reception or rejection in the West, and the attitude to it of the Church of England and Anglican divines. It would be out of place to review the first story as if this were a full-scale study, and those who want to understand the iconoclastic controversy will need to go even further than E. J. Martin's book, which Dr Moss recommends. The account given here explains what the controversy was about and what, essentially, the Council decided, with its all-important distinction between worship proper (*latreia*) and reverence (*proskunesis*); and how its work was misunderstood, and later ignored, by a West which had not experienced the conflicts which produced it and which blurred the vital distinction by translating *proskunesis* with *adoratio*. (It is curious to see Emile Amann struggling with the linguistic problem in French, in Fliche-Martin, *Hist. Eglise*, VI, 118-19). There is also a brief comment on Aquinas, who taught that *latreia* should be offered to pictures of Christ, though not of the saints.

As to the Church of England, Dr Moss starts as though he wants it to accept the Council *simpliciter*, and appears to use the *Reformatio Legum* and the 1571 Articles as official and binding documents. Later, however, his case is moderately and sensibly stated. He allows that Anglican divines have paid little attention to the Council; in fact his only explicit witnesses before the nineteenth century are Field, who is partly hostile, and Beveridge. Thus the *majority* who are "agreed that there is nothing in it with which Anglican principles are inconsistent" (p. 41) are the majority of the tiny minority who bother about it at all.

What he eventually asks for is that the Convocations should formally "assent to the definition of the Seventh General Council, which condemns both idolatry and iconoclasm, and declares that it is lawful to have pictures of our Lord and of the angels and saints in our churches" (p. 52). If it will help the Orthodox, by all means let us formally condemn idolatry and iconoclasm and formally allow pictures. What Anglican will object? But "assent to the definition . . . which . . . "? We must be careful. The definition does not merely allow *proskunesis* of images; it commands it. Note how Headlam, as quoted on p. 41, inaccurately modifies this to "allows". And if assent to the Council as such is required, many Anglicans will find its remarks or implications as to the relative status of Scripture, Church, and Tradition a stumbling-block, even though we are trying to consider this problem with open minds. Further, some of the Canons of 787 are impossible for the Church of England. Dr Moss himself writes sensibly that our Eastern brethren cannot fairly expect us to have the same religious habits as they have, that we need not have pictures, and, if we do, must show our respect in our own way. But must we not also be free to ignore them when we will? He hedges. "The respect which we ought to give, and do give, to sacred pictures corresponds to the veneration or prostration required by the Second Council of Nicaea." Does it? And will this satisfy a church which, we are told, cannot compromise on the councils and will probably require of us formal assent to them?

On the general issue of reunion with the Orthodox, caveats need to be entered. The Anglican churches do not claim to be Orthodox (p.57); they claim to be orthodox. Orthodoxy with a capital O is not in every respect an ideal for us, a correctness and fulness of truth and practice which we are gradually approaching, e.g. by accepting II Nicaea! Dr Moss comments that the Eastern churches "having escaped the disputes between the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, are for that very reason better fitted than we are to break the deadlock which those disputes have caused." True, in some ways; and we are willing to be helped. It is also true that there are many good things which the Eastern Churches did not learn from the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Counter-Reformation, and their self-satisfaction can be extremely irritating, however humble and eirenical and ecumenical one tries to be.

S. L. Greenslade

DARK AGE AUTHORS

EARLY MEDIEVAL THEOLOGY. (Library of Christian Classics, Vol. IX.) Edited by G. E. MCCRACKEN and ALLEN CABANISS. S.C.M. 35s.

THE most recent volume of the S.C.M. Library of Christian Classics covers what is in reality a dullish period in the history of Christian thought. The Patristic period has come to an end, and the flowering of the Scholastic Age still lay in the future.

The joint editors are a Professor of Classics and a Professor of History, the one a Protestant and the other (apparently) a Roman Catholic. Between them they have done a most competent job in the selection and translation of their documents, many of them done into English for the first time.

The volume opens with the *Commonitorium* of Vincent of Lérins, at first sight a curious intrusion from the Patristic Age. It is, however, good to have this treatise made available in this particular series, and the work itself summarizes not inaptly much of the doctrinal approach of the period under review. The editor rightly accepts the current view that it was directed against the tighter forms of Augustinianism in the semi-Augustinian interest. The Eucharistic controversy in the ninth century is represented by the works of Paschasius Radbertus (in selections) and Ratramnus, the chief protagonists. Here attention is called to the important differences in terminology as used by the two authors. Of special value to the historian of Christian thought is the careful account of the varying fortunes of the book of Ratramnus in later ages. The specifically doctrinal section of the volume ends with selections from the Reply to the Three Letters which probably emanated from the *scriptorium* of Lyons. It is devoted to the controversy on Predestination associated with the name of Gottschalk. But why is room not found for some extracts from the writings of Boethius, who exercised such an important influence upon medieval theology?

The exegetical section of the book opens with the Dedicatory Letter to the Commentary by Gregory the Great on the book of Job, which vividly depicts the author's approach to his task. The essentially derivative character of much of the work of the period is illustrated by the Commentary of Alcuin on the Epistle to Titus which is heavily indebted to the work of Jerome. A similar traditionalism is exemplified by the sound and careful, though scarcely original Commentary on the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel from the pen of Rupert of Deutz. Considerably greater vigour of thought is to be found in the work of Claudius of Turin.

The medieval approach to the sermon is introduced by the little treatise of Guibert of Nogent on "How to make a sermon". While possessing the inevitable limitations of works of this kind, it is full of good sense, expounds the normal medieval doctrine of the four senses of Scripture, and shows some grasp of the spiritual perils which beset the preacher. Three examples of liturgical preaching are given from the

work of Rabanus Maurus, while more solid doctrinal fare is provided in the sermons of Ivo of Chartres and Agobard of Lyons on the Apostles' Creed. The exposition of the Lord's Prayer also by Ivo of Chartres is a most workmanlike exposition. The principles of Church music are discussed in a sermon of Agobard, which lacks a title in the manuscripts but which the editor properly describes as "On the Divine Psalmody".

The piety of the period is depicted in two addresses to the clergy, the one anonymous and the other by Theodulph of Orleans, better known as the author of the hymn, "All glory, laud, and honour". The former, almost entirely written in the imperative mood, is largely a set of practical counsels of the pastoralia type, but the latter gives a far deeper insight into the pastoral ideals of the period. It is more like George Herbert's *Country Parson* than a set of extracts from the Canons. The final excerpt is the familiar, but always moving account of the life and character of St Aidan by the Venerable Bede.

The historical introductions and bibliographies are well done. While the general reader is not overloaded with detail, those who wish to go further are not left without competent guidance. The brief notes on the text are such as we have come to expect from this particular series, though they are sometimes on the thin side and leave certain points without comment where the ordinary reader might reasonably have expected some guidance. What, for example, exactly, were the "fanon" and the "planeta" which occur on p. 391? Presumably some kind of vestments. At certain points the comments of Professor Cabaniss should be received with some caution. And should Richard Baxter be considered as evidence for the attitude of the Church of England to the *Commonitorium* as is implied on p. 31?

If this volume is not likely to have the immediate popular appeal of some other contributions to this series, the editors have certainly placed us in their debt by making available a wide range of material not otherwise readily accessible.

H. E. W. Turner

THE MEANING OF HISTORY

History and Eschatology. By R. Bultmann. Edinburgh University Press. 15s.

A pronouncement from Dr Bultmann on his views of history has long been awaited. The difficulty of deciding what he meant by myth was intensified by the difficulty of understanding what he meant by its opposite—if indeed history is opposite to myth. The assertion made in some quarters that he did not believe in history at all met in others with an indignant denial. Hence it is certain that the present slim

volume of Gifford Lectures will be eagerly consulted. At least Dr Bultmann has met the challenge of his critics and endeavoured to answer it.

How much satisfaction will be derived from the answer may be doubted. The book is interesting—how could it be otherwise from so erudite an author?—and it pays flattering attention to the works of English writers, particularly R. G. Collingwood, but it does not show at critical points the characteristic English plainness of statement. It is most illuminating when it passes in review the theories held by previous writers: it is elusive in the comparatively small space allotted to the author's own views.

Dr Bultmann is of course much concerned about the eschatological event, but he does not appear to think that it has much to do with the notion of the Kingdom. On p. 32 one reads of Jesus that "he holds out no prospect for the future of the people". True enough, but there was a balancing consideration, "Fear not little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom." One looks up the index, but the subject does not appear there at all. The only references to the Kingdom we have been able to discover are in quotations from other writers. But should not the notion have loomed rather large in any Christian consideration of history and eschatology?

The omission is the more odd in that Dr Bultmann is so interested in investigating what Collingwood called the "inside" of an event that he seems to lose interest in its "outside", or what we should call its objective history. Very rarely he lets us suppose that he accepts the factuality of the external event. Thus he quotes with approval Erich Frank, "Although the advent of Christ is an historical event which happened 'once' in the past, it is, at the same time, an eternal event which occurs again and again in the soul of any Christian in whose soul Christ is born, suffers, dies and is raised up to eternal life." But how much is to be regarded as included in the historical event this volume nowhere reveals.

W.W.

CATHEDRAL HISTORY

A History of St Paul's Cathedral and the Men associated with it. Edited by W. R. Matthews and W. M. Atkins. Phoenix House. 50s.

No less than three authoritative studies on St Paul's Cathedral have appeared in the last two years, and now Dean Matthews and his six collaborators have written a book to end all books on St Paul's, at any-rate for this generation. All six of them write serious history with an easy style, and the book can be recommended for the armchair when

the day's work is done. Professor C. N. L. Brooke starts off with the earliest times down to 1485, keeping the chronological highway within sight, but for the most part threading his way through the deep and various country on either side of it. Canon Carpenter follows with the events of the Reformation, the fire of 1561, William Laud, and the Commonwealth. The end of Old St Paul's and the building of the New are covered by Mr Tindal Hart's essay, and the reforms of the nineteenth century and the personalities connected with them by Mr Atkins. The Dean brings the story up to the present day, and Mr Martin Briggs concludes the symposium with an admirable account of the history of the fabric.

Sir Ernest Barker, in a graceful foreword, calls Professor Brooke's chapter "a fundamental contribution to English historiography". This is certainly no overstatement. He elucidates the cathedral's constitution as reorganized after the Conquest on the Norman pattern of a fully secular body of dean and canons, with the appropriate hierarchy of minor canons, vicars, and choristers, and the estates divided up into prebends. The battle of "residence" was joined here, as in all the secular cathedrals, and was not settled until, in the early thirteenth century, a clear distinction was drawn between the canons who were resident and those who were absentees. The residentiaries claimed, besides their prebend, a share in the common fund, while those non-resident received the income of their prebend and nothing more. But to qualify as a residentiary of St Paul's, a canon had to perform the "greater residence", consisting of personal attendance at the day and night offices for a whole year and involving a heavy round of entertainment which might cost him as much as a thousand marks. No doubt, as at York and Lincoln, this expensive and rigorous novitiate was intended to test the applicant's stability, and he who came through was given the proud title of "stagiary". Thus, in the middle ages, the cathedral had canons of two distinct types, many of whom adorned its history. There were the stagiaries, such as Ralph de Diceto, canon and dean for the last half of the twelfth century, no mean scholar and chronicler, as Bishop Stubbs has taught us; and then there were the non-residents, probably pluralists, of whom surely the greatest was that prebendary of Reculverland known as St Thomas of London. Not that the absentees were always a disadvantage to St Paul's. In a litigious age, when every grade in the judiciary was served by clerks, paid largely by the emoluments of prebends or other church preferment, it would be surprising if, when the Dean and Chapter needed a friend at court, there would not be a prebendary or two of St Paul's on the bench or at the bar. The whole of this brilliant essay abounds with illuminating sidelights on English church life and its personalities, whether it be estate management or the "food farm", papal provision or clerical marriage; or biographies of Richard of Wendover, the physician, Gilbert the Universal, scholar of the new learning, or William Booth, financial wizard and afterwards Archbishop of York. Perhaps lack of space or lack of evidence permitted no more than a passing reference to the minor canons and vicars. It

would have been interesting to know how they fitted in to the rota of residence.

St Paul's provides the classic illustrations of the reason why the Reformation had to be the violent affair that it was. In the new climate of thought men were disgusted with the irreverence of the clergy, with the neglect of the Chapter, and with the idleness and ill repute of the minor canons and the choir. Dean Colet tried hard to reform these abuses, but the Chapter and the Bishop were too much for him, and he placed his famous school under the aegis of the Mercers' Company, and not under the Dean and Chapter. Neither Bancroft in 1598 nor Laud in 1631 was any more successful. The nave was still used as a public market, as a passage-way for porters, or, as advertized in Dekker's *Gull's Horn Book*, a promenade for traffic less reputable. The choristers still ran about the church during service time, demanding "spur money" from strangers. These boys were exploited in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as a dramatic company, performing their plays in St Gregory's church, hard by the south-west corner of the nave, and were perhaps some of Shakespeare's "aery of children, little eyases that cry out on top of question, and are most tyranically clapp't for't". The truth was that the cathedral did not want to be reformed, and it never was until revolution had brought the whole organism to a standstill, and the great fire of 1666 had demolished most of the building.

Every cathedral in England is a kind of microcosm of St Paul's; they have experienced the same national and religious changes, and have reacted to them similarly. But there are two exceptions: none has been almost wholly destroyed by fire, and none, since the twelfth century, has had a rebuilding such as St Paul's received at the hands of Wren. The end of Old St Paul's and the building of the New, with Wren's patient struggle, first to get a design approved, then to get it built, and finally his rejection before the work was completed, make a fascinating and moving story. For the rest, the history of St Paul's differs from that of other cathedrals only in scale. The lethargy of the eighteenth century was followed by the reforms of the nineteenth and the expansion of the cathedral's functions in the twentieth; and this has been the common pattern. But no other cathedral had in these centuries a succession of deans like Milman, Gregory, and Inge; or canons like Sydney Smith, Liddon, Lightfoot, and Newbolt; or even a Maria Hacket to bully the Chapter into caring for the education of their choir-boys. Indeed the impression which this delightful book leaves on the imagination is that at St Paul's everything is just a size larger than it is anywhere else.

SEIRIOL EVANS

RELIGION AND HISTORY

AN HISTORIAN'S APPROACH TO RELIGION. By ARNOLD TOYNBEE. Oxford University Press. 21s.

A CULTIVATED Englishman at the end of the seventeenth century would expect to take under his purview (more or less) the whole range of human knowledge. Thus Sir Isaac Newton was as interested in theology as in physics: and Sir Christopher Wren thought of himself as more than just an architect. Such days certainly seem remote in 1958. Indeed, not only is the whole territory of learning too vast for one mind to encompass, but each field within it is now too intensively cultivated for a single labourer even to reap the harvest. Yet if there is one man who can claim to have mastered his subject in general outline, it is Dr Arnold Toynbee, as his *A Study of History* abundantly testifies. The seemingly effortless ease with which he transports himself from one civilization to another, irrespective of time, place, and circumstance, is indeed remarkable, though it is important to notice that this feat is made possible only by prodigious industry and by a sustained passion to discover meaning in history, to detect patterns and to infer general laws, yet such a quest urges Dr Toynbee on only because he is a Western European nurtured within a specifically Christian tradition.

An Historian's Approach to Religion consists of two courses of Gifford Lectures delivered in Edinburgh in 1952-3, and it may be regarded as a follow-up of the marathon *A Study of History*. The reader already familiar with the author's thought will undoubtedly be grateful for this more concentrated reflection on the general relationship of religion to social and political ideologies, and will appreciate that such reflections (as hinted above) illustrate that Dr Toynbee is one of those rare historians who is prepared to make such value-judgements as his investigations may confirm but cannot originate. For example the equation of "self-centredness" with "original sin" is of this nature, for it crosses the divide which Professor Sorley used to say separates "what is" from "what ought".

Perhaps, however, it is the last few chapters in this book which the thoughtful Christian will find most stimulating. Here, in brief, Dr Toynbee maintains that religious fanaticism and aggression in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries induced Western Europe to abandon a traditional religious ideology and to take over, not a revivified Hellenism, (as might have happened) but a scientific ideology which has brought with it the modern technological age. It is the latter which, allowed to pursue its course undirected, has brought mankind to the edge of the abyss. "In fine," Dr Toynbee writes, "we, in our generation, have as good a reason as our late-seventeenth-century predecessors had in theirs for trying to jump clear from a traditional approach to the mystery and for making a new start from a different angle. So, in our generation, let us set our feet on the spiritual path again, but, in making our jump in our turn, let us take care not to

fall into our predecessors' mistake. Let us be sure to bring away with us the mental tools that Experimental Science and Technology have been forging during these last 200 or 300 years; for it would be unwise to discard them until we have found out whether they can be adapted for use in striving to reach the spiritual goal which is now again to be our objective."

It is man's self-centredness, Dr Toynbee reiterates, which has made his science a nightmare, though this fact must not make us forget that "we cannot return to the traditional Christian vision of the spiritual universe or to the post-Socratic Greek philosophic vision of it after having delved into the mysteries from the mathematical-physical angle for a quarter of a millennium." Yet it is just this self-centredness—man's ultimate problem—which the higher religions seek to subdue, and they do so by accepting creatively the fact of suffering: "In the judgment of Christianity and the Mahayana even the extremity of suffering is not the highest price to pay for following the Lord's lead, for in their judgement selfishness not suffering is the greatest of all evils." The challenge to religion in the modern crisis is, therefore, to enable man to realize his true end, and to redirect the course of history into a more purposeful channel: though it will only do this by learning the lessons of its own past failures. In this respect Dr Toynbee has much to say which Christian readers may well find challenging, and the more timid, maybe, a little unsettling. So far from being depressed by the "annihilation of distance" which has resulted from modern technology, he sees rich possibilities ahead from the increasing contact of the higher religions with each other—that is if they can purge themselves of that same self-centredness which has prostituted the use of science and poisoned the spirit of nationalism. "If we do not feel", he writes, "that we can afford to wait for Time to do its discriminating work, we are confessing to a lack of faith in the truth and value of the religion that happens to be ours. On the other hand if we do have faith in it, we shall have no fear that it will fail to play its full part in helping human souls to enter into communion with the presence behind the phenomena and to bring themselves into harmony with this Absolute Reality. The missions of the higher religions are not competitive; they are complementary. We can believe in our own religion without having to feel that it is the sole repository of truth. We can love it without having to feel that it is the sole means of salvation."

A short review is no place to embark upon a detailed criticism of a work of this kind. It might well be argued, of course, that some of Dr Toynbee's generalizations, though challenging, are not always convincing: that they are projections of a faith rather than the basis of it, since the raw stuff of history is too amorphous, too complex, to be tidied up so neatly. Yet even if such criticisms be true, it but emphasizes the need to attempt some explanation of the seeming chaos ("Surely thou art a God that hidest thyself") and to make sense of it.

It may be, again, that some of Dr Toynbee's contrasts are too stark and conceived too much in terms of black and white to reflect the subtle

shades of historic reality. For example, can we write off the modern age quite so baldly as "technological" even if the discription is helpful; and is it adequate to talk of the "motives that moved seventeenth-century Western Man thus deliberately to transfer his treasures to Technology from Religion"? Were they *all* transferred?

Yet if the reader feels such hesitations he will recognize in them a tribute to the magnitude of the task which Dr Toynbee has undertaken. What the present reviewer wishes—though Dr Toynbee may well regard this as outside his province—is that he would suggest at greater length how Christianity, while remaining true to itself, may creatively coexist (to their mutual advantage) with the other higher religions, seeing that they must necessarily keep company with one another for many centuries to come.

E. Carpenter

QUAKER PIONEER

Elias Hicks: Quaker Liberal. By Bliss Forbush. Columbia University Press. London: Cumberlege. 45s.

Macaulay sometimes tried to reassure his readers by introducing an observation with some such remark as the following: "As every schoolboy knows . . .". Yet even he could hardly have extended this generous optimism to include a knowledge of the religious history of America. Indeed I suspect that the name of Elias Hicks, the subject of this thorough and documented biography by Dr Bliss Forbush, Headmaster of the Friends' School in Baltimore, is almost unknown in this country to general readers.

Elias Hicks (1748-1830) was an itinerant Quaker minister who during the course of a long life travelled by horseback or carriage over 40,000 miles of pioneering country, often sleeping rough and speaking with passionate but reasoned conviction in many a Maryland tobacco barn, a Pennsylvania stone meeting house, or in a state capital. He gave his life with selfless devotion to what he regarded as the primitive Quaker Gospel, and thus laboured to rescue it from doctrinal elaboration and authoritarianism. This was not easy in his day, for there was a real danger that Quakerism might be absorbed into the general pattern of American religious life and cease to bear its particular witness. Hence Elias Hicks was a lifelong supporter of separate Quaker schools, and gave liberally to build them where they were needed. In the same spirit, he remained firm in his pacificism (when some weakened during the War of Independence) and was absolute in his condemnation of the slave trade.

Primitive Quakerism, as Elias Hicks understood it, was also menaced

during the latter years of his life by the doctrinal pressure and psychological appeal of the evangelical revival, made more alluring in America by the persuasive eloquence of itinerant Quaker preachers from England. The climax came in the Quaker Separation of 1827-9, concerning which Dr Forbush has many interesting things to say. Elias Hicks saw in the insistence on evangelical doctrines such as that of the atonement as essential to Quakerism a serious attack on the freedom which was the historic birthright of the Friends. In reply to this challenge, he anticipated later theories of progressive revelation, and himself gave priority to the "Inner Light", which made Whitman describe his appeal as being essentially directed to "the moral mystical portion of human nature".

In making this stand, there can be little doubt that Elias Hicks was being true to the genius of early Quakerism: which is why he could be liberal, rational, and at the same time conservative. It was the simplicity and independence of the first days of settlement which appealed to him, and it is not surprising that he opposed the new industrialism with its factories and railways. If modern America (despite all its ambiguities) has preserved a passion for liberty, it has certainly not followed Elias in this latter respect!

Every biographer has to make up his mind whether he will adopt a chronological order or group his material according to its subject-matter. Both have their advantages and compensating disadvantages. In choosing the former, Dr Forbush probably did wisely, for the life of Elias Hicks leads up to the Separation of 1827-9: but this method has necessitated a measure of repetition which here and there takes away from the interest. Dr Forbush, in a foreword, half excuses himself for his many quotations from the newly discovered journal of Elias Hicks, but there is certainly no need for such an apology. Indeed some readers may wish that there had been more quotations of a homely character, suggestive of the primitive conditions which must have confronted Elias on many a journey—but perhaps the rugged Quaker did not often use his journal in this way.

The chronological treatment also means that Hick's theological position emerges as the story of his life unfolds itself, and this is as it should be: but we wonder, in addition, whether a chapter might not have been set aside for a systematic statement of his views.

The general format of this book is what we have come to expect in American productions of this kind. Certainly Dr Forbush is to be congratulated on providing a full length biography of a heroic, devout, and essentially simple Quaker who enabled many an American Friend to be true both to reason and to faith.

E. Carpenter

SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY

THE PRINCIPLES OF SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY. By BERNARD LEEMING, S.J. Longmans. 30s.

THIS is a book of unusual importance. There has hitherto been no full and systematic account of Roman Catholic sacramental theology available in English. Fr Leeming has not only provided it in a coherent and readable form, but he has also, in writing for the English theological public, kept an observant and not unfriendly eye upon his separated brethren. On a variety of themes he pays particular attention to Anglican writers, in whose works he has read widely, and his occasional interventions in their current controversies are always constructive and will repay close consideration. They deserve too, it goes without saying, to be read in the context of his general argument.

Fr Leeming's seventeen Principles emerge at strategic points in the course of an exposition which is presented historically, and he carefully examines the origins of each aspect of sacramental doctrine in scripture and the Fathers before passing on to more recent developments. In the areas of his subject not covered by conciliar and papal definition (and he is no minimizer on the question of the papal authority to determine the matter, form, and minister of sacraments, particularly where the sacrament is that of Orders) he can be refreshingly critical of earlier theories and expressions; he is quite ready to jettison notions of "physical" or "intentional" causality which he regards as, for present-day English usage, unhelpful and misleading. He instead defines the efficacy of sacraments in terms of the union they effect with the Mystical Body of Christ—a definition which will be welcomed and which has obvious points of contact with de la Taille's theory (about which he is not so enthusiastic) that each of the sacraments gives grace in so far as it is related to the Eucharist—the sacrament of the Mystical Body *par excellence*. His explanations of the Catholic terminology of grace should also go far towards reassuring those to whom it remains suspect.

To turn to an issue which divides Catholics and Protestants, it is much to be wished that those theologians who regard themselves as implacably opposed to the expression *ex opere operato* should carefully study Fr Leeming's account of its meaning, and that they should not be put off by the fact that like them, though for a contrary reason, he opposes it to *sola fide*. In itself *sola fide* (as expounded, e.g., by Père *Bouyer*) no more excludes objectivity in the sacraments than *ex opere operato* disregards faith in the recipient, and it is high time that the two ceased to be treated (in both quarters) as strictly alternative.

Another vexed question has been that of validity. On this Fr Leeming has some pertinent criticisms of the *Report of the Commission on Doctrine*, of the late Bishop Kirk, and especially of Professor Greenslade's identification of sacramental validity with fruitfulness. His arguments for the Augustinian distinction seem unassailable, but it could fairly have been pointed out that the contemporary situation stretches it even from

the Catholic side; for though Augustine recognized, as against the Donatists, that a sacrament could be valid but unfruitful, he nowhere envisaged, as Fr Leeming's argument by implication does, the possibility that it could be fruitful but invalid. Fr Leeming concludes with the helpful suggestion that Anglicans and Free Churchmen discussing sacraments should drop the word *validity* altogether and instead give reasons why certain sacraments are never repeated.

Fr Leeming's examination of the "character" imparted by those sacraments leads him into a long discussion of the seal of the Spirit, and (in spite of his own disclaimer) of the relation to it and to each other of Baptism and Confirmation. He tries very hard to achieve a *modus vivendi* between the two sides in the Anglican debate, as represented by Professor Lampe and Fr Thornton, claiming that both are right in what they affirm and wrong in what they deny: on the one hand that the baptized are indwelt by the Holy Spirit, and on the other that there is an unrepeatable sacramental gift in Confirmation. (He is very severe in an appendix on Dix's view of the influence of the Forged Decretals.) He is more successful in showing that there are two distinct moments in the process of Christian initiation than he is in assigning a precise and constant meaning to the second, which is variously described as "the perfection of baptism", "a special share in the apostolic mission of the Church" (but not in the lay priesthood, which is given in Baptism), "courage to confess Christ", "a recognized adult standing in the Church", or (in the case of an infant confirmed *in extremis*, as the Holy See now urges) "a particular union with Church Triumphant". There is a theological difficulty about the idea of bestowing the Holy Spirit, in any sense, on those who have already received him; and there is an historical leap from Christ's original institution to the current conception of Confirmation. Fr Leeming's Principle XII lays down that "a sacrament of the new law cannot be defined without including the immediate institution of it by Christ", and though the scope of this is afterwards restricted to the *essential meaning* of a sacrament, leaving the Church free to determine matter and form, it is still unclear how St Thomas' statement that Christ instituted Confirmation "not by bestowing it but by promising it" could apply to a sacrament in which the Holy Spirit (according to him and to Fr Leeming) is not bestowed for the first time. A similar difficulty arises over Unction; Fr Leeming has not only to argue backwards from apostolic practice to an assumed institution by Christ, but also forwards from a rite plainly intended to convey healing to a rite which in modern Roman practice "sacramentalizes the condition of dying". The leap is a large one.

It is a pity that Fr Leeming did not work out the application of this priniciple in greater detail. It would have meant a more systematic treatment of scripture, and would have shown up the difficulty, in the light of modern criticism of the Gospels, of any certain distinction between *verba Jesu* and *verba Christi in ecclesia*. Mat. 28. 18 and John 20. 23, both of which he uses, are notable cases in point. Fr Leeming's own attitude to biblical criticism emerges clearly in a footnote on

Kittel's *Wörterbuch* which deplores its lack of reference to patristic and Catholic commentators; this is to misapprehend the purpose of Kittel, which was to elucidate the N.T. authors' own meaning, not to furnish a history of later interpretation in the Church. Again, he complains of the variety of renderings of the word *mysterion* (so inconvenient to the sacramental theologian!) in Knox's translation of the N.T. One is forced to wonder how important he thinks the original meaning really is.

There is clearly plenty of room for further studies which will bring the insights of the critical biblical theologian to bear on the traditional theology of the sacraments (in the way already adumbrated by Dr J. G. Davies and Mr Neville Clarke). Anglicans are well placed for such an undertaking, and it would be no more than a fair return for the constructive and eirenical approach of an eminent Jesuit to their own theology.

HUMPHREY GREEN

LITURGICAL STUDIES I

HYMNS OF THE ROMAN LITURGY. By JOSEPH CONNELLY. Longmans. 28s.

MANY of the hymns of the Roman Liturgy have become well known and loved in translations in modern hymnals, where they have set a standard of devotional sobriety and doctrinal soundness that later compositions have not always equalled. But such translations are inevitably paraphrastic and partial, though some have perhaps caught the underlying spirit more successfully than literal versions.

The present work is designed primarily for those who will use the hymns as part of the Divine Office, and require not only information about the origin and history of the hymns, but also help in understanding the not infrequent obscurities of the Latin. The hymns are therefore set out with translations and largely linguistic notes, so that the pattern as a whole resembles a school edition of the classics, and the work as such has an obvious value. But brief as the notes are, they leave no theological implication unexplained,and give sufficient help with the historical allusions in the Proper of Saints.

The general introduction, which is supplemented by brief introductions to the separate sections of the book, deals shortly but adequately with the origin and development of the Latin hymn and its use, and continues with a clear and valuable account of the metres employed, quantitive and accentual verse, and the use of rhyme. The account of the versification would have been clearer if the various medieval systems had been written out in long and short signs, instead of being only referred to by their rather formidable technical names. "Elegiac" curiously

appears consistently as "elegaic", while the reference to Kennedy is of little value.

The main body of the work is divided into four parts, hymns of the days and hours, of the seasons, of the Common of Saints, and of the Proper of Saints. The sectional introductions outline the dominant ideas of the hymns, as far as they have a common theme. The notes on each hymn, after a short account of the author, where known, the metre, and the use, give considerable help with the language, and quote freely from the Vulgate. Where an author is indebted to a classical writer, the reference is given. No attempt is made at an exhaustive treatment of questions of authorship, but again adequate references are given. Here, in the extremely brief biographical notes, curiosity is whetted rather than satisfied. A better use of the space available might have been made by shortening those portions of the notes which merely parallel the translations or serve as a substitute for a dictionary. The reason for their duplication, no doubt, is that the translation was only added at a later stage, but it does take up room that might have been given to information that must otherwise be sought in libraries.

The present text of a hymn is rarely that of the original. Liturgical considerations made changes inevitable, while later the scourge of the humanist revisers fell upon many of the less classical lines. Where either has occurred the original is given, and the author makes no secret where his sympathies lie. The comment "*Accessit latinitas, discessit pietas*" is, as he shows, true not only of the Humanists, but of almost all succeeding Latin hymnody. His own words in speaking of modern Latin hymns, "Our Lady survives the modern hymns but lives in the old ones", apply to many modern English liturgical compositions, in prose as well as in verse.

The translation is intended to express the thought and words of the text in modern English. It is in general literal with no attempt at elegance or liturgical terminology, and is careful and accurate, but on the whole does not seem to attain its object exactly. It is not always sufficiently literal, especially in the more difficult passages, to make the original clear to those with little Latin, while the occasionally clumsy style fails somewhat to convey the spirit of the original. For this the material is no doubt responsible. The ancient hymns are almost as difficult to translate as a collect, while the flatness of some modern examples becomes only more obvious in translation. There are a few unimportant omissions of words and short phrases, which need not mislead the reader. Where the meaning or construction is ambiguous, or the least doubtful, the information is given.

The whole work is a pleasure to use in respect of printing and the arrangement of material. References are accurate, and misprints few. Obviously it is a labour of love and the fruit of long familiarity with the text and the needs of those for whom it is designed.

D. R. Dendy

LITURGICAL STUDIES II

THE LITURGY AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By MASSEY H. SHEPHERD. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

THOUGH the study of Liturgy has advanced greatly in the past half-century, contributions to it have most frequently been designed for the specialist, and have often been available only in periodicals out of reach of the majority. On the other hand there have been numerous handbooks, aimed rather at the fostering of devotion, that have owed little to modern scholarship.

There is therefore room for such a pamphlet as the present, derived from lectures delivered in Tokyo and Hong Kong, and now published in the hope that it will serve as a guide to "parochial and diocesan study groups that desire a better comprehension of the treasures of faith and worship enshrined in our national heritage".

The first chapter, on the Liturgical Movement, deals not only with its history in the Roman Church, but with the work of the Commission on Ways of Worship of the World Council of Churches. From this emerged a clearer awareness of under-lying problems, the relation of Word and Sacrament in worship, the doctrine of sacrifice, and the opposition between fixed and free forms of worship. In his historical summary of the whole movement the author does not mention either the work of the classic French liturgists or the influence of the Scottish Prayer Books of 1637 and 1764.

In the succeeding chapters the author deals competently with the development of the Christian year, the history and doctrine of Baptism, in which he perhaps inevitably minimizes the difficulties of early evidence, but fairly states the contemporary divergence in Anglicanism, the early history of the Eucharist and the changes made at the Reformation, and the Daily Offices, a chapter which, though historically slight, is valuable for its treatment of the psalter.

There are a few statements open to criticism. The fourth century is too early a date for the establishment of a forty-day Lent. The Creed was not inserted in the East directly before the Consecration, nor was it introduced into the West in the ninth century. No distinction of date is made between the early and medieval additions to the primitive structure of the Mass. The influence of Eastern liturgies, especially St James, on modern developments should have been mentioned.

A short bibliography is appended, which will facilitate the wider knowledge the author seeks to foster.

D. R. DENDY

ORGANIZATION FOR LITURGY

THE EARLY PAROCHIAL SYSTEM AND THE DIVINE OFFICE. By G. W. O. ADDLESHAW. Mowbray (for the Alcuin Club). 3s. 6d.

THIS pamphlet is described as "Alcuin Club Prayer Book Revision Pamphlet XV". It has, however, nothing to do with this subject. It is a paper read at an Alcuin Club meeting; and its subject is the organization of churches with particular reference to the celebration of the Divine Office.

Canon Addleshaw draws the distinction between parish churches of the "first foundation" and the "second foundation", and describes their staffing and work—especially their liturgical work. In view of the remarkable missionary achievements of the old collegiate churches he suggests that churches after the same pattern may be the most suitable way of providing for the pastoral needs of the "new housing areas". He admits that there are formidable difficulties in the attainment of such an ideal. But he does not take into account the most important of these, namely the difference in the attitude towards the Church of "pre-Christian" and "post-Christian" paganism. In the dark ages a collegiate church established in the way described by the author must have been an object of interest and speculation, a new thing; but to-day such an establishment would appear to the outsider simply as a familiar institution which he imagined (however wrongly) that he understood sufficiently and dismissed as irrelevant to his needs.

As an historical essay the paper is of considerable interest, for the study of the history of the ways in which the Church has tried to fulfil its mission is a subject too little cultivated. But it is a pity that when the paper was printed the opportunity was not taken to add references to sources; and a greater use of English examples would have been welcome.

BERNARD WIGAN

CONTEMPLATION

RICHARD OF ST VICTOR: SELECTED WRITINGS ON CONTEMPLATION. By CLARE KIRCHBERGER. Faber. 21s.

HERE are available for us for the first time in English works of one whom Dante described as more than human in his powers of speculation. A full and scholarly Introduction enables the reader to understand the place in the development of theological thought occupied by these writings and appreciate from the outset their true value. Richard himself states that he has been "speaking in a leisurely way to men at leisure". Part of the charm of this collection is that it breathes a most refreshing air of "leisure", while the selections save us from wearisome elaborations and repetitions.

In his teaching on Contemplation Richard is a pioneer. A Scot, drawn to Paris by the reputation of St Victor where he became Prior in 1162, he indubitably owed much to his predecessor Hugh. However, his own writings, combining the fruits of the scholarship of both East and West and pressing forward from mere exegesis of Bible passages to an attempt at orderly treatment of Biblical subjects, present us with an arresting psychology of prayer. At the same time his purpose throughout is the opposite of coldly academic; he is intensely practical. Towards the end of his teaching on contemplation he gives a grave warning: "If we have an affection for something which we do not love for God's sake, the adulterous affection immediately breaks the constancy of the highest charity and diminishes its strength in proportion as it draws or drives the soul to extraneous desires. . . . We must indeed ask earnestly, seek diligently, knock loudly and continue perseveringly in all these things, if we would obtain what we desire."

The Holy Scriptures inspire him throughout. In this he bears strong resemblance to St Thomas à Kempis in the *Imitation*. However, his treatment of the passages which he uses is remarkably different. Allegory for him is the master key: "Jacob as we read had two wives. Leah was more fruitful, Rachel more beautiful; Leah though fruitful was blear-eyed, Rachel though sterile was well favoured. Now let us see what these two wives of Jacob signify that we may more easily understand what their sons mean. Rachel is the teaching of truth, Leah the discipline of virtue. Rachel is the search for wisdom, Leah the desire for righteousness. . . . Their handmaids Zilpah and Bilhah are necessary to their mistresses . . . but I think we must not be silent about their vices—these handmaidens who mean Imagination and the Senses. Bilhah is garrulous and Zilpah is drunken. The wine Zilpah desires is the joy of pleasures, of which the more she drinks the greedier is her thirst. But the Imagination cries out with such importunity in the ears of the heart that Rachel can hardly ever silence her clamouring. This is the reason why, when we are saying Psalms or praying, though we would shut out phantasies of thought or the images of things from the eyes of our heart, we are unable to do so. . . . Surely everybody knows Bilhah's garrulity

and Zilpah's drunkenness unless they do not know themselves." Intriguing and stimulating as is this use of the Bible, some of his points might not be accepted by everyone to-day. He categorically states that the Scriptural descriptions of Heaven must all be taken symbolically but the descriptions of Hell literally. "The heavenly Jerusalem is often described as being adorned with gold and silver, pearls and other precious gems. Yet we know that none of these things are in that place from which no good thing is absent. None of these things is there in reality while all are present in 'likeness'. . . . None of the faithful reading in Holy Scripture about hell, the flames of Gehenna, the outer darkness, believes that these things are symbolical, but everyone is sure that they exist somewhere in a material way." He gives no objective facts or logical reason for this arbitrary interpretation.

One of the most thought provoking and stimulating parts of his teaching is no doubt his guidance on progress in prayer, elaborated in his scheme of the relationship between the imagination, the reason, and the intelligence in the work of contemplation. He illustrates his meaning by instancing sights commonplace in his day, animals and fishes leaping up into the air to explain ecstasy of soul, iron plunged in a furnace for the soul warmed by love, sunlight reflected by the surface of the sea, "the purer the water the purer the light", so the purer the heart the greater the illumination of the man. Sometimes a crisp phrase sums up pages of teaching: "Thinking crawls, meditation marches, contemplation flies around and when it wills it hovers upon the height. . . . The work of meditation is to seek out hidden things, that of contemplation to wonder at clear truths."

Surprises await the reader, glimpses of delight in the nature of the created order and the beauty of nature and his claim that music refreshes the spirit and not merely the soul. Perhaps for our present age faced with the task of Unity, unity in God through love, it is of special help to find most definite views in one who writes before ever the medieval Church was rent by its convulsions. He most vigorously maintains that true unity can only be in loyalty to Bible Truth. "If you feel you have seen Christ transfigured, do not believe too easily whatever you may see in Him, or hear from him unless Moses and Elias are with Him. . . . I suspect every truth which is not confirmed by the authority of Scripture nor do I accept Christ transfigured unless Moses and Elias bear Him company. . . . let Him show the authority of Scripture, not only figuratively but openly. It is a lovely and joyful spectacle when in the revelation of truth, clear reason presents itself at this point, and both the historical and figurative reading concur in support of that revelation. Otherwise I shall be afraid in full daylight, lest I be deceived by the mid-day devil. For whence come all heresies and errors except that the spirit of error transfigures himself into an angel of light?"

T. L. Manson, S.S.J.E.

HENSON'S SERMONS

THEOLOGY AND LIFE. By H. HENSLEY HENSON. Mowbray. 10s. 6d.

THIS little book of 128 pages contains nineteen sermons by Bishop Henson. It is a pity that its price may curtail its sale amongst those to whom it would be most helpful, namely, the parochial clergy. It is not a book to borrow from a library but to keep by one. The Bishop left behind a large collection of sermons preached over nineteen years in the diocese of Durham, and it is to be hoped that editor and publishers will give us more of them in a cheaper edition.

The title is a reminder of the preacher's task. It is no easy task, for, as the Bishop says, "Our age is not interested in theology, but is intensely interested in man . . . It is therefore particularly easy to belittle or ignore the influence which our theology must needs have on our conduct. . . . Doctrine draws with it conduct in harmony with itself." The busy parish priest will find these sermons a real help in the preparation of his own, and a guide in relating theology to life. They are essentially teaching sermons, arranged roughly to follow the Christian year and dealing with such subjects as the Bible, the Second Advent, Idolatry, St Paul, the Church, the Picture of a Christian Church, etc. Two of the most interesting, "Christ, the Author of Division and Peace" and "Remembering and Forgetting", deal with the paradoxical character inherent in Christianity. There are plenty of arresting phrases and comments which will not readily be forgotten, and most of them are relevant to the times in which we live. But it would be interesting to have brief notes of date and occasion for each sermon. One sermon appears under the title "The Christian Life", but this could be applied to the whole collection. "The two essentials of true religion are active concern in the needs and sorrows of others, and a high standard of personal goodness." "It is distinctive of our religion that the Object of our worship is also the supreme embodiment of morality." This is his theme throughout, and it is presented simply but uncompromisingly on almost every page.

In his introduction Canon Stranks tells us something of the Bishop as a preacher. He took great pains in preparation, disliked extempore preaching and anything which seemed slipshod or familiar, believed that exegesis was the best instrument of teaching, and considered that the best examples of this were "Chrysostom among the ancients, Leighton in the seventeenth century, and among the moderns Robertson of Brighton". The sermons reveal the Bishop as a man of deep and simple religious faith whose ideal was a pastoral ministry.

GEORGE WILLESDEN

SPIRITUAL DIRECTION

A Guide for Spiritual Directors. By The Author of "The Way". Mowbray. 9s. 6d.

The writer of this book, already known to many as the author of *The Way*, *Following the Way*, and other devotional works of great merit, tells us that he has given up forty years entirely to the work of spiritual direction and the hearing of confessions, and that this book is a summary of the experience gained in the treatment of hundreds of penitents. "It is offered", he says, "not as an authoritative work but simply as a contribution of experience which may assist others to reach more final conclusions."

We are not then here dealing with a source book like that of the Abbé Gaumé's *Manual*, nor with a clear and comprehensive account such as that of our own Canon Belton's *Manual for Confessors*. As this is so, and the book is really an exposition of one method of direction, the title should say so—for example "A Guide to One Method of Spiritual Direction", or simply "A Method of Spiritual Direction".

The book falls into three parts: the first unfolding the author's method of diagnosis and treatment, the second his counsel on prayer as the necessary way to spiritual growth, and in the third part all this teaching is exemplified in the answers to problems set in the course of a dozen fictitious confessions, where the reader is advised to write down his own answers before reading those of the author.

There is much good writing on the close relation between fear and sin—a point repeatedly made by St Francis de Sales—and of the need of the director to get at the chief cause of troubles and not to be side-tracked by symptoms. The writer does not adequately define his attitude to psychology, nor does he tell us at what point the psychiatrist or physician should be called in, and how much psychology he expects a director to know. Nevertheless, it is clear that Freud, Adler, and Jung have all contributed to the author's understanding.

In dealing with Prayer the author uses Von Hügel's famous analysis of the elements of religion (institutional, intellectual, and mystical) as a basis for some excellent teaching on the need for respecting the *attrait* of each individual soul, but for seeing that all these elements have their part in his spiritual life.

In spite of the writer's express limitation of the scope of this book we must feel that it is in danger of falling between two stools. It could not be offered to a young priest without other works, while the experienced confessor would have problems of which the book says nothing. These difficulties would certainly be diminished if the author could add to any further edition a reasonable bibliography and an index.

George M. Bosworth

THE MESSAGE OF THE KINGDOM

MESSAGE FOR A MISSION: THE KINGDOM OF GOD AS A CHRISTIAN IDEOLOGY. By O H. GIBBS-SMITH. Mowbray. 2s. 6d.

THIS book is small in size but rich in content. It consists of four chapters, of which the first is introductory. The second is a sermon preached in St Paul's Cathedral in 1957 on "A Christian Ideology for the Nation". The third and fourth chapters are articles contributed to the national press, one on "Planning for a National Mission", and the other on "Concerted Preaching". Each chapter is systematically arranged, and the style throughout is singularly clear and concise. The Archdeacon asks two highly relevant questions. First, What should be the distinctive content of the Church's message to the nation to-day? And second, How should this message be presented? To both these questions he gives his own incisive answers.

The Church's message to the nation to-day should be an effective presentation of the Christian social gospel. It should be presented as "a Christian ideology", that is, as "a systematic scheme of ideas about social life". This would meet the existing demand for a gospel which deals not only with the belief and conduct of the individual, but also with "the salvation and re-creation of Society as a whole, whether 'society' be thought of as the family, the nation, or the world". It would not be a precise practical programme, but a Christian social pattern. The theological basis for such a contemporary Christian ideology should be "the non-institutional concept of the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven". This was the master-thought of our Lord, and the dominant theme of his recorded teaching. The Kingdom of God is necessarily concerned not only with the individual, but also with the structure of society. The function of the Church is to promote its coming, and the formulation of a social Gospel of the Kingdom should be accepted "as a corporate commitment by Christian scholars".

This social Gospel should be presented to the nation as the main message of a National Mission to be conducted by the Church of England. The basic organization required for such a mission lies ready to hand in diocese and parish. The missioners would be the parochial clergy, assisted by a number of chosen laity. Both clergy and laity would be briefed from the centre, so that the message of the mission would be proclaimed simultaneously from every pulpit. The Archdeacon shows that this is a thoroughly practical method. It has been demonstrated successfully in the Mission to London held in 1949, and in the work of the Clergy Centre in the same Diocese. The briefing system was warmly welcomed and effectively used by many of the clergy, and "there is no inconsistency between corporate preparation and individual inspiration".

In an appreciative foreword, Bishop Wand rightly points out that the book "is concerned with one thing, and one thing only, the winning of the unconverted multitudes for Christ". It is in fact a piece of original

thinking on the subject of evangelism, and as such it has the highest value. The Archdeacon of London has earned the gratitude of the whole Church, and his book may be commended most warmly to all who are looking for leadership in evangelistic work among our people to-day.

G. J. Inglis

SOCIETY AND GOD

The Signs of our Times. By Maldwyn Edwards. Epworth. 22s. 6d.

Dr Maldwyn Edwards has written a good book, but it is the sort of book which has been written so often before. Not often perhaps so well as this author has written it, for he has a lively style, marred only by a fondness for over-familiar quotations. There are a few textual errors. Dr Edwards writes "D.B." when he means Percy Wyndham Lewis, conflates J. L. and Barbara Hammond into a single personality, and is under the impression that *A Little Bit of Fluff* was a "musical" produced in the Twenties and not (as it was) a farce put on during World War I.

Such slips are not of course of any consequence. Nor perhaps does it matter if the signs of our times are discerned as others have already discerned them, if the diagnosis is correct, as in this instance it almost invariably is. But the plan of the book (described rather oddly as *a* lecture) does lead, inevitably perhaps, to a good deal of repetition. It is divided into four sections, dealing successively with the contemporary "debates" on Man, the State, Society, and God. Such a book is not easy to review satisfactorily, since its argument is too comprehensive to be summarized with justice, while if a few salient points are selected for notice the predilections of the reviewer may so obtrude themselves as to obscure the full purpose of the author.

Dr Edwards says, I think with justification, that "by future writers 1914 will be regarded as a great watershed of history". But one reader cannot but recall that the summary given here of the cultural situation of those pre-war years had been even more effectively set forth in advance by John Neville Figgis in *Civilization at the Crossroads* two years before catastrophe fell upon the world.

How much did man learn from the experiences that befell him between 1914 and 1920? Dr Edwards declares that "The world in the twenties had made an important discovery. The instruments men use, such as education, science, and economics, had no independent vitality, of themselves they were morally neutral. Everything depended upon the use to which they were put." But he does not add, as he well might have done, that this "discovery" has not in fact led to any widely accepted

practical deductions. And this is natural, since—as it is clear that our author would agree—so long as men have no clear understanding of purpose for human society, they will be driven back, even against their better judgement, to a faith—or at least a wistful expectation—that their "instruments" will suggest a meaning for them. Religiously considered, our world to-day is not so much vicious or even "hubristic" as reluctantly—or even unconsciously—idolatrous.

What hope in such a situation? To one reviewer the most interesting and significant chapter in this book is that entitled "The Return of Order". As Dr Edwards rightly says: "The moment you speak of respect and of orderliness you are on the road of moral imperatives and at the end of that road is God . . . If there are rules there is a Mind which is responsible for them." And again: "The recovery of a sense of order in the world and the active search for it, in the family, education, work and leisure, are indications of a revival of interest in religion."

All that Dr Edwards writes on this theme shows him at his best, and that best can be very good indeed. In discerning the signs of our times here he gives us no shallow optimism but firm and well considered grounds for hope.

MAURICE B. RECKITT

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

NOTES FOR THE ASSISTANCE OF GOVERNORS AND MANAGERS OF CHURCH SCHOOLS. By J. C. POWELL-PRICE. National Society and S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

THESE notes by the former Legal Secretary of the National Society, which have been published at the request of the Schools Council of the Church of England Council for Education, provide Governors and Managers with a clear and concise guide for the conduct of their day-to-day business. Men and women who serve the Church in this capacity are drawn from every walk of life and, we may suppose, comparatively few of them are legal experts. It is therefore most desirable that they should have access to a guide which is as free as possible from obscure technical language but is at the same time definite and reliable. This particular publication fulfils these purposes quite admirably. The language is clear and precise. The facts are marshalled in a logical order and cover the ground in a way which shows that the author has had a wide experience of giving advice to the ordinary lay person. The temptation to wander from facts into the realm of argument and the expression of personal opinion has been sternly repressed. Such self-control has avoided many pitfalls into which authors of this kind of guide have not infrequently fallen. Some people may consider that this

has deprived the work of a certain amount of interest, but it was not the intention of the writer to stimulate interest or to debate the pros and cons of the current situation in the field of educational administration.

A careful balance has been preserved between the needs of different types of Church Schools, though, in this respect, we think that the writer might with advantage have stressed the importance of striving to the utmost to preserve the status of Aided Schools, rather than allowing any more of these at some future date to lapse into the category of Controlled Schools. We know from bitter experience how hastily such a decision can be taken when Governors or Managers are confronted by a temporary difficulty which may seem to be insurmountable at the time, but which may well prove to be a positive opportunity if it is faced with faith and resolution. The fact that certain dioceses are at the present time extracting every ounce of value out of Controlled Schools within their jurisdiction, ought not to blind us to the fact that that value is strictly limited in influence and in time. In influence, because it does not appear to be reasonable to think that, with a *minority* of "Church Managers or Governors", the tail will continue to wag the dog. In time, because it seems to be equally unreasonable to expect the secular Educational Authority to continue indefinitely the financial upkeep of a Controlled School when it could, for similar expenditure, maintain a regular County School.

In the two introductory paragraphs to the Notes, there is an admonition to Governors and Managers to consult Diocesan Directors of Education whenever they are "in doubt". This is so important that it might usefully have been printed in heavier type to give it extra emphasis.

Finally, we would give unstinted praise for the excellent index, which is quite indispensable in a work of this kind.

F. A. Poulden

RESCUE WORK

Ragman's City. By Boris Simon. Harvill Press. 18s.

The Abbé Pierre (Henri Grouès), son of a silk manufacturer of Lyons, worked with the *Maquis* during the war (having already been a parish priest for some years). He spent his time in rescuing Jews and other hunted persons; was twice taken prisoner and twice escaped; became a Deputy (M.P.) after hostilities ceased, in the hope of raising his voice on behalf of the homeless and ignored; went into the rag and bone business; and collected an army of companions of all classes who learnt to share his eager passion to help the multitude of down and outs, left behind in a ravaged France.

None of this is told in *Ragman's City*, which rather unwarrantably assumes throughout that you have read the volume to which this is a sequel, and know all about the Abbé Pierre. In *Ragman's City* the Abbé is an elusive figure who scarcely appears, but the inspiration of whose personality keeps the actors on the move.

The book consists of a series of forty or fifty quite disconnected vignettes. We all know the type of garrulous person who discusses the doings of aunts or cousins whom we have never met, and expects us to take an intelligent interest in them. I could not help being reminded of such a person when characters, of whom no previous mention had been made, kept popping up for some brief anecdote, to fade into oblivion after a couple of paragraphs—possibly to make a meteoric return after twenty pages.

None the less the story is a moving one, as the story of thousands of homeless and hopeless people is bound to be. The Abbé, mentally and physically exhausted as he was, somehow secured the headlines of the papers, and the radio. He became "news value", and a film company enacted his salvage operations for the screen. Here and there a politician, and a lady of high degree; multitudes of ordinary folk; not a few converted—and unconverted—rascals, all joined in the effort to provide bed and board for the dispossessed, and the conscience of the country was stirred.

The book gives little factual detail. We are vaguely given to understand that housing estates named Emmaus and Pomponnette came into being as the fruit of the Abbé's work, and that the Government was moved to cut red tape. But it is not so much the story of a social achievement, as that of the impact of one man's service and sacrifice upon the lives of helpers and helped. Let one illustration suffice:

In the bitterness of winter a few young men came to him saying: "Father, our parents will be organizing committees and finding lodgings for the homeless, but we would like to start from scratch, we would like to live like you, to try to save people, to set up communities. How should we begin?" He would reply: "If it is not just chivalrous instinct; if you are responding to some profound need in the depth of your soul, then go and put up a tent outside the town, and begin to cultivate a manure heap. The first poor devil to come and work with you will get drunk. The second and third will fight each other, the fourth will rob you, perhaps the fifth will hate you and try to kill you. By then, you will either have had enough, or you will stick it out. Perhaps you will save the sixth man, and then it will all have been worth while."

The Abbé's spiritual progenitor is St Vincent de Paul.

T. Dilworth-Harrison

CHURCH AND SCHOOL

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION REVIEWED. By SPENCER LEESON. Longmans. 16s. 6d.

THE first sentence in this valuable book gives the clue to its writer's intention: "Every activity, if it is to bear full fruit, requires a clear and conscious purpose in the minds of those engaged in it." Dr Leeson, in his Bampton Lectures on *Christian Education*, caused many of us to re-think our own ideas about the task of the Christian teacher, and in this book, finished just before his untimely death, he gives us the fruits of his own further reflections on this subject.

The first chapter on "Christian Education, its Meaning and Purpose" is possibly the finest statement of the Christian view of education that has been written in the English language, and it will influence the thought of Christian educationists for many years to come. Dr Leeson will not allow any opposition between humanism, properly understood, and the Christian interpretation of life: he is proud to be in the tradition of men like Colet and More. In his Bampton Lectures, he gave much space to an interpretation of Plato's teaching, and he never wavered in his belief that it was an essential part of our educational heritage. But in this chapter he goes further, and seeks to clear humanism of the confusion of thought which has caused many Christians to revolt against it. For him "only the humanism that is Christian can rightly be called humanism at all; and to a Christian teacher Christian humanism is his very light and life". Equally he stands firm by the Christian faith as "the most rational, comprehensive penetrating and ennobling interpretation of the origin, nature, duty and destiny of human beings ever presented to them". The appended note to this chapter—"Pastor Pastorum", a meditation on John 10. 2-15—is deeply moving.

Against this background, Dr Leeson goes on to consider how Christian education in its successive stages has developed in the past ten years. His experience as schoolmaster, headmaster, parish priest, and bishop ensures that what he writes is not only accurate but also realistic, and he examines every part of the educational system with reference to the spiritual and evangelistic challenge which it presents. In a short review there is not space to comment in detail on the author's observations. Not everyone will agree with all his judgements—but no reader can fail to appreciate the force and conviction of his arguments.

It is good to be reminded, as we are in Chapter 3, that "there will not be effective Christian education where there is not a Christian home: instruction at school in the facts of the Bible and the Church there may be, but it will not by itself fully possess the soul of the child. . . . if we want Christian education, we must convert the people to the Christian faith and so make it count in their homes. Till that is achieved, all will be partial and precarious." But Dr Leeson does full justice to the work of the teachers and he gives a valuable description of some of the agreed

syllabuses of religious instruction. One criticism he makes "not only of the agreed syllabus, but of the teaching of the whole Church . . . that the Church does not always present the Gospel to the world as it is—an offer of salvation from a deadly peril, in eternity as well as now."

At various points in this book Dr Leeson has developed the arguments in favour of Church of England Aided Schools, for which he strove so hard as Chairman of the Church Assembly Schools Council. He states fairly the advantages and disadvantages of controlled status, but he leaves the reader in no doubt that he himself believed that, for the sake of Christian education itself, there should be as many Church Aided Schools as the Church, at the centre and in the dioceses, could afford to bring up to proper standards of building and maintenance. As Chairman of the Schools Council, he pleaded the cause of Aided Schools in the Church Assembly with compelling force and emotion. In the June session, 1957, the Assembly gave final approval to the Measure empowering the Church Commissioners to make grants for aided Church schools: that decision was due in no small part to the efforts of Dr Leeson in the past.

No review could do full justice to this book. It is not only full of ripe educational wisdom: it is also full of the love of human souls. In his last book, as in his life, the author never lost sight of human personalities: he never allowed himself to forget the children for whose service all educational law and administration should be designed. It is this which gives to *Christian Education Reviewed* a character all of its own, and which makes it a book to be read by every teacher and priest —and by all who care that education in this country should be in the fullest sense Christian education.

✠ Robert Petriburg:

A GREAT PRELATE

Archbishop Garbett: A Memoir. By The Prioress of Whitby. Mowbray. 10s. 6d.

"That pattern which made his life was one of unchanging stability of purpose and constancy in direction"—so writes the Prioress in her admirable memoir of the late Archbishop. In the six main periods of his life the authoress shows how the same characteristics were exhibited in ever developing form. There was the strong disciplined religious life based on the teaching and practice of the Church of England; the power of concentrated work; the strong pastoral spirit; a zeal for social justice and a consciousness of his own power of leadership. Even in his family life at Tongham these characteristics became manifest; at Oxford his

powers of leadership were shown by his becoming President of the Union.

His twenty years at Portsea as Curate and Vicar are rightly stressed as of great importance on Garbett's life. His strong pastoral instincts and his zeal for social justice were developed and made him ready to undertake the episcopal charge of the great diocese of Southwark. His own long pastoral experience enabled him to understand the problems of the parochial clergy. To meet the spiritual needs of the vast population crowding into the diocese he started and brought to a successful conclusion the Twenty-Five Churches Appeal. The efforts Bishop Garbett made to bring order into the workshop of the churches in the diocese are not perhaps sufficiently stressed in the Memoir. These met with a considerable measure of success. When the call to Winchester came in 1932 it was a great change, but brought him much happiness. The Prioress suggests that the Winchester years had a mellowing effect upon him: certainly with advancing years he became more approachable and less of a disciplinarian.

Bishop Garbett was 67 when the Northern Primacy was offered to him. The Memoir suggests that this offer awakened qualms within and without. The Bishop felt at his age such a task was perhaps beyond him; and some in the Province questioned whether his past experience really qualified him for a position rather different in character. These fears proved groundless. As Archbishop, Garbett displayed the old characteristic of devoted pastoral ministration to clergy and people and astonished all by his power of work, in his diocese, in the province, and in the Church at large.

There were also two new developments. Under the chapter "The Written Word" the Prioress stresses the value of the three fine and helpful books which the Archbishop found time to write in the midst of all his labours. *The Claims of the Church of England, Church and State in England, In an Age of Revolution.* Then under the title of *An Anglican Ambassador* the extensive travels of the Archbishop, unique in the history of the Church, are dealt with. He went to all parts of the world bringing a message of hope and encouragement.

The words of the Prioress on p. 77 might be said to sum up the book: "What is the picture? That of a man of solid and consistent integrity who kept God at the centre; one who discovered his vocation as a member of God's Church and as such gave himself single-heartedly throughout a long life to such service as pastor, administrator, statesman, and father in God."

✠ F. O. T. Hawkes

AMERICAN CONSERVATISM

PROSPECTS FOR CONSERVATIVES. By RUSSELL KIRK. Henry Regnery Co., New York. $1.25.

BEYOND THE DREAMS OF AVARICE. By RUSSELL KIRK. Henry Regnery Co., New York. $2.75.

THE early history of the original thirteen United States along the Atlantic seaboard was culturally an extension of the life of the European nations from which the first settlers and their descendants had come. It was only when the bolder spirits pressed inland, beyond the tidal waters, over the mountains, to meet the challenge of the frontier that the characteristically American culture began to emerge. In time the men from the West came back to Washington to be rulers of the nation; and with the inauguration of Andrew Jackson in 1829 the change was assured. A noisy party in the White House dismayed the federal capital, while leaders in society declared that the rabble reminded them of the French Revolution.

These two manifestoes of American conservatism are in effect an appeal behind Andrew Jackson—who never seems to get a mention in their pages—to the cultivated society of Washington and Jefferson, Madison and the Adams family. Dr Kirk is very clear that the American Revolution was really not at all like what took place within a few years in France. "There cannot be too many gentlemen among us", he writes, in admiration of the ideals of Burke and Newman, while he deplores the decay of humanistic studies, declining for more than a century. "Our 'Revolution' was a movement intended to preserve the traditions of American society against the innovations of George III and his friends, not to create a new order in the thirteen colonies." That had to wait. The frontier was to be open to spoliation and there was to be the spoils system in politics. Yet "Americans have more to conserve, probably, than have any other modern people; and conservative impulses are more general among us than anywhere else." It is refreshing to learn that conservatism involves a belief in original sin; and one admires the dexterity by which Reinhold Niebuhr is enrolled as a conservative thinker. "I trust that none of us shall become political Christians; but I hope that none of us shall not be afraid to infuse Christian faith into politics. A society which denies the heart its role becomes, in a very short order, a heartless society."

These quotations are from *Prospects for Conservatives*, issued in one of the paper-backed volumes which have become such a feature of American publishing. In much of his energetic, if repetitive advocacy of what many would call tradition rather than conservatism, Dr Kirk carries the reader with him. It is when one reads the larger, more recent book, *Beyond the Dreams of Avarice*, that doubts arise more quickly. For in part of this he is writing about Britain; and not with very great perspicacity. Here his conservatism appears as a de-bunking of the Welfare State, and a failure to understand the problems and forces

which called our present organization of society into being. He is dolorous about the new town of Glenrothes in Fifeshire; but he hardly seems to have been inside the houses whose exterior design he finds so depressing. There is more life around than sociologists always realize. "The rootless new town, the sprawling housing-estate, the town-council bungalows in their drab uniformity, the metropolitan blocks in their lowering severity"—all make him thank his stars for the "unenlightened chaos of American domestic building". He has also been told that "out of some 165 clergymen in the diocese of York, it is said that scarcely a dozen are regular readers of serious books: the reading parson is following the literary bishop towards extinction".

It is good to see ourselves as others see us; and there is a drabness in English life which to an outsider must often appear overwhelming. There is much here to cause us to think. But one hopes that when next Dr Kirk crosses the water somebody somewhere will give him a good time.

H. G. G. HERKLOTS

THE NEAR EAST

"AND UNTO SMYRNA." By S. W. H. BIRD. James Clarke. 6s.

THE historian engaged in recording the development of a nation or a continent must of necessity concentrate upon the broad sweep of events. His narrative inevitably moves from one place of importance to another. In this process the living community is frequently forgotten as though it were of no importance. Yet it is in the local community that the individual has his being and apart from him history is a mere abstraction. There is an advantage therefore in the study of a small area examined from the point of view of its own changing population. Moreover, in the case of a centre like Smyrna (Izmir), such limitation provides the exciting opportunity both of re-creating the impact of the place itself upon contemporary events and also of depicting the effects upon the local community of movements outside it.

The Reverend S. W. H. Bird, who has been the Anglican Chaplain at Smyrna since 1949, has made good use of his time and has produced within short compass a lively presentation of Smyrna's history, not merely, as the dust-cover inaccurately suggests, the story of the Anglican communities in Asia Minor. His narrative gives ample evidence of painstaking and careful research which has enabled him to place on record facts that are not included in the general run of historical works.

Smyrna is the ancient Greek word for myrrh and the author sees in this a symbol of the "consistent pattern of suffering and martyrdom" which his book reveals. Here St Ignatius, a prisoner in chains, wrote four

of his celebrated letters, here St Polycarp taught and in A.D. 155 suffered martyrdom. Later the Crusades took their heavy toll of life both Christian and Muslim, whilst in the twentieth century the Armenian and Greek communities of Smyrna disappeared, some slaughtered and others driven out as refugees by the Turkish army. Since the rise to power of Mustapha Kemal, idolized by the Turkish people as Ataturk, Smyrna has experienced the peace which goes with tolerance. Mr Bird, however, is aware of storm clouds piling up when he writes in his concluding paragraph: "The three great monotheistic religions stand united to-day against atheistic Communism."

To present within 124 pages a historical survey from the dawn of Christianity to the present day is no mean feat. Unfortunately compression and the author's partiality for detail have resulted on some of the pages in a somewhat arid, guide-book style contrasting curiously with the fluent narrative which delights the reader elsewhere. He would have been wise to take more for granted, for example his excursus on the origins of Islam could well have been pruned. Restraint here and in other sections would have allowed room for the more leisurely treatment of lesser known events and even the reporting of additional episodes. One incident, the expulsion from Smyrna of a puritanical Chaplain sent out to minister to the English "factory" (i.e. trading community) in the seventeenth century is prodigiously entertaining. One of the best chapters deals with the behaviour of the Greeks after 1918 and in particular with the part played by Chrysostomos, as Metropolitan of Smyrna. Recent events in Cyprus give these pages a piquant contemporary interest.

The book is well produced and is enlivened by several attractive illustrations.

A. E. A. SULSTON

SKY PILOT

BATTLE HYMN. By DEAN E. HESS. Peter Davies. 15s.

THIS is an American success story of an unusual kind. The sub-title on the dust-jacket, "Chaplain turned Fighter-Pilot", is inaccurate. What Colonel Hess did was to choose to be a combatant rather than to serve in the chaplaincy corps, for which he had been accepted. The sudden events which followed Pearl Harbour stirred a double doubt. He felt inadequate as a minister. He felt that he had no right to let others fight for him while he remained a non-combatant. "I was capable of offering the routine solaces required in a parson's normal rounds; but what could I give to shaken, wounded, dying men? To men who every day, perhaps every hour, faced the imminent possibility of a violent, painful

death? How could I give them reassurance unless I knew what they were undergoing?" Service as a fighter-pilot in Europe was to raise many questions; but he remained convinced that he was right in his decision. He had chosen the lesser of two evils; to fight rather than to allow fascism to overrun the world. But the *leit-motiv* of the book is from the fifty-first Psalm: "Deliver me from blood-guiltiness, O God . . ."

In a small town in Ohio, Marietta, the author, of German extraction, belonged to "the Christian Church, one of the town's twenty-three denominations". Here he became known as a boy-preacher; and went on to work his way through the neighbouring College, taking an optional course in aeronautics which revealed him as a natural flyer. This came in useful, as the churches of his denomination to which he was appointed, or to which he was invited as a preacher, were widely separated. Sometimes he would get hold of an aeroplane and get there that way. At the time of Pearl Harbour he was well settled in his ministry and married.

After World War II he allowed his name to remain on the Air Force reserve, and, rather to his surprise, was called up for service in Korea. It seemed right to go. Once again, however, he was appalled by the indecencies and brutalities of war—in which all members of belligerent countries are implicated, though it may need a book like this to remind them of that fact. He knows the look on a man's face when he discovers that the line of trucks which he shot up, thinking they contained enemy troops, actually contained refugees. Indeed one might hazard that events in Korea brought him to a deeper understanding of the Atonement than he might have obtained by taking a post-graduate course on the subject.

Step by step he was led to the work with which his name is specially associated; the rescue of orphan children, who seemed to proliferate where he went, and their establishment on the island of Cheju. Here he would like to set up a simple stone, "Dedicated to the Memory of those whom we could not Save." For they were many. But here, at any rate, are some children saved from starvation and Communism. Colonel Hess is still in the Air Force. But some day he may return to a country church in Ohio. "Perhaps when I am older, I shall once again be its minister—if I feel myself qualified and if the good and simple people of that farming community will accept me in spite of all that I have done in an airplane."

This book is a genuine document; repetitive, rather wearisome in places, as personal accounts can be. But it should be read. It shows what war is. It shows also that love and faith can live and win their triumphs in a world of hatred and unbelief.

H. G. G. Herklots